NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THE LIBRARY.

PhD
1921
K


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

http://archive.org/details/bookofhabakkukfr00king

THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK FROM THE STANDPOINT OF LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM

BY

WILLIS JEFFERSON KING

(A. B. Wiley, 1910; S. T. B., Boston, 1913)

A Dissertation
Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

GRADUATE SCHOOL
BOSTON UNIVERSITY

1923.

THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK FROM THE STANDPOINT OF LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM

BY

WILLIS JEFFERSON KING

(A. B. Wiley, 1910; S. T. B., Boston, 1913)

A Dissertation
Submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

GRADUATE SCHOOL

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

1921.

THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK FROM THE STANDPOINT OF LITERARY AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM

BY

WILLIS JEFFERSON KING

(A. B. Wiley, 1910; S. T. B., Boston, 1913)

A Dissertation
Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the
degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

GRADUATE SCHOOL

BOSTON UNIVERSITY

1921.

Ph D
1921
k

PREFACE

- P R E F A C E -

In the book of Habakkuk we have one of the most difficult problems of the Old Testament. Many and able writers have contributed to the literature of this subject, and it may with reason be asked why another treatment should be offered by one who makes no pretension to mature and seasoned scholarship, either in this field or any other.

In the first place, in spite of the many discussions on the subject, no one treatment has been adjudged satisfactory by any large body of scholars. So the field is open to discussion until some satisfactory solution of the problem has been given.

In the next place, perhaps the writer's own intense interest in any and all Old Testament problems may be a sufficient excuse for his temerity in attempting a solution of what is known to be one of our most difficult problems.

Nor is the writer sanguine enough to believe that the view here advanced will prove entirely adequate for all the problems connected with the book. He does hope, however, that there may be found in this discussion a real contribution to the problem.

In this connection the writer believes that a definite contribution has been made in the following particulars: First in the matter of the aim of the prophecy. It was not intended to predict the coming of the Chaldeans, nor even, primarily, their destruction; but to bring comfort to the distressed and "heavy-hearted" countrymen of the prophet. Incidentally it did predict the downfall of the Chaldeans, but this was only in

- P R E F A C E -

line with the fundamental work of the prophet, to "declare the purpose and will of God for his people", during every peculiar crisis of their lives.

Another contribution, the writer submits, is with reference to the date. Any date, to be satisfactory, must include all the historical situations suggested in Chapter I. The date which most nearly comprehends these various historical situations is, in the view of the writer, the period 586 - 585 B. C.

Another view, entirely new, as far as the writer's observation goes, is that Habakkuk was among the first, if not the very first, to give the implication in his prophecy, that the "Day of Yahweh" was not the Exile, as had been suggested by the earlier prophets; but that the "Day of Yahweh", even after the Exile, was yet to come. It was to be a manifestation of Yahweh's power over a proud and haughty nation.

Wherever possible credit has been given to the works of other scholars. Particularly is the writer indebted to Nicolardot and Stonehouse, the two latest writers on this subject, for their very complete bibliographies, and their very trenchant criticisms of the most important works in this field from 1843 to 1911.

In like manner is he under deep obligations to Franz Delitzsch and A. J. Baumgartner for the work done in collecting and criticising the legends dealing with the life of Habakkuk.

Above all, the writer owes an everlasting debt of gratitude to Professor Knudson of the Boston University, both for the inspiration to this task, and for constant encouragement through the years, until the task was done.

And finally, to the many kind friends who by word of advice, or sympathy, or both, have made their contribution to this work, the writer is full of grateful appreciation.

Willis J. King.

Jan. 8, 1921.

And finally, to the many kind friends who by word of advice, or sympathy, or both, have made their contribution to this work, the writer is full of grateful appreciation.

Willis J. King.

Jan. 8, 1921.

* B I B L I O G R A P H Y *

BIBLIOGRAFIA

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Alexander, W. L.---Habakkuk, Encyclopedia Britannica, XI, 1880, pp. 355-358. He thinks the book is a unity and was written during the reign of Josiah. One of the reasons assigned for this date is the numerous coincidences in sentiment and phraseology between this book and those of Jeremiah and Zephaniah.

Baumgartner, A. J.---Le Prophete Habakkuk, 1885. This author sets forth at length the views of the Hebrew rabbis and commentators touching Habakkuk. He thinks the book a unity and to have been written during the reign of Manasseh. His bibliography is very complete, extending from 1526 to 1885.

Betteridge, W. R.---The Interpretation of the Prophecy of Habakkuk in the American Journal of Theology, 1903, pp. 647-662. Betteridge accepts Budde's theory that the Assyrians are the oppressors, but does not see the necessity for the removal of 1:5-11 from its present position. He thinks the book a unity and would date it about 701 B. C.

Billing, A. G. L.---Forsök i Utlägning af Habakkuk, Lund, 1865. Here we have a book of 75 pages, comprising an introduction, translation and commentary. He thinks the book a unity.

Bleek, F.---Ein eitung in das Alte Testament, Berlin, 1878, pp. 430-432. Bleek divides the book into two parts, chs. 1 and 2 comprising the first part; ch. 3 the second part. Chs. 1 and 2 he holds were written during the reign of Jehoiakim. Ch. 3 was written some time later.

Böhmer, J.---Habakuks Schrift im Feuer der Neuren Kritik, in Neue Kirkliche Zeitschrift, Erlangen, 1899, pp. 724-735. Böhmer takes the view that the reference to the "Chaldeans being

raised up" is future only in the sense of being dramatic. 1:5 serves as an introduction both to the Chaldeans in 1:6f and to ch. 3. From 2:4 to 3:1 we have the response of the prophet. He would eliminate 2:8, 17, 13.

Bredenkamp, C.---Die Tafelinschrift Habakkuk 2:4, in the Theol. Studien und Kritiken, Gotha, 1889, pp. 161-164. A brief exegetical discussion of Hab. 2:4. The author first compares the M. T. of this passage with the LXX. He follows this with the translations of Ewald, Hitzig, Delitzsch, and finally his own.

Briggs, C. A.---The Book of Psalms, 1914, vol. I, p. LXXIII I. Dr. Briggs inclines to the view that Habakkuk 3 was originally a part of the Psalter, and was subsequently removed to the book of Habakkuk. Another reference is to a discussion of the musical term "Selah".

Budde, K.---Habakkuk, in Studien Und Kritiken, Gotha, 1893, pp. 383-393. It was in this article that Budde first set forth the view that the oppressor in 1:2-4 was the Assyrian.

Budde, K.---Poetry (Hebrew) in H. B. D. vol. IV, pp. 3-13, New York, 1905. A comprehensive discussion of Hebrew metre, with special attention to the kina metre and the strophe. Problems of Prophetic Literature, 2., Habakkuk, Expositer, May, 1895, pp. 372-385. In this article Budde criticises a view which had been published a short time before by Rothstein. He reiterates his view that the Assyrians were the oppressors, and dates the prophecy about 615 B. C. Habakkuk, in Encyclopedia Biblica II, London, 1901, pp. 1921-1928. The same general view is expressed. Geschichte der Althebraischen Literatur, Leipzig, 1906, p. 90ff.

Bickell, G.---Carmina Veteris Testamenti Metrice, 1882. A book of 236 pages, containing critical notes on the poetical sections of the O. T. On p. 213f. the author gives a metrical arrangement of ch. 3 of Habakkuk. According to this arrangement the chapter consists of 11 strophes of 6 lines each, and each line contains 7 syllables.

Berry, G. R.---Habakkuk in the Americana, vol. 13, p.602. The Encyclopedia Americana Corporation, New York, 1919. It is the opinion of Dr. Berry that most of 1:12-2:20 was written by a single author, toward the end of the exile (about 550 B.C.) He thinks 2:12-14 is doubtless a later addition, as is also v. 11; and ch. 3 seems to him to have been of post-exilic composition.

Carriere, Aug.---Etude Historique et Critique sur l'epoque de la prophetie d'Habakkuk, Strasbourg, 1864. A book of 40 pages. Carriere regards the book a unity and dates it about the close of the 7th century B. C. His discussion of the views of other writers is interesting and helpful.

Cheyne, T. K.---An appeal for a more complete Criticism of the Book of Habakkuk, in Jewish Quarterly Review, Oct. 1907, pp. 3-30. This author is impressed with Marti's arrangement of the text; and thinks ch. 3 was not written by Habakkuk, but is post exilic. Further, he takes the unique view that we have here the account of the Arabian invasion into Judah, followed by a Jewish captivity in Arabia.

The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter, London, 1891, p. 125, 156, 210, 214. Here our author discusses ch. 3.

Bloxell, T.---Carmina Veteris Testamenti Metrice, 1882. A book of 236 pages, containing critical notes on the poetical sections of the O. T. On p. 212f. the author gives a metrical arrangement of ch. 3 of Habakkuk. According to this arrangement the chapter consists of 11 strophes of 6 lines each, and each line contains 7 syllables.

Berry, G. R.---Habakkuk in the Americana, vol. 12, p.602. The Encyclopedia Americana Corporation, New York, 1919. It is the opinion of Dr. Berry that most of 1:12-2:20 was written by a single author, toward the end of the exile (about 550 B.C. He thinks 2:12-14 is doubtless a later addition, as is also v. 11; and ch. 3 seems to him to have been of post-exilic composition.

Carrière, Aug.---Étude Historique et Critique sur l'époque de la prophetie d'Habakkuk, Strasbourg, 1864. A book of 40 pages. Carrière regards the book a unity and dates it about the close of the 7th century B. C. His discussion of the views of other writers is interesting and helpful.

Cheyne, T. K.---An appeal for a more complete Criticism of the Book of Habakkuk, in Jewish Quarterly Review, Oct. 1897, pp. 5-30. This author is impressed with Marti's arrangement of the text; and thinks ch. 3 was not written by Habakkuk, but in post exilic. Further, he takes the unique view that we have here the account of the Arabian invasion into Judea, followed by a Jewish captivity in Arabia.

The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter, London, 1891, p. 128, 136, 210, 414. Here our author discusses ch. 3.

Critica Biblica, II, 1903, p. 170-173.

Condamin, Al.---La Forme Choral du ch. III d'Habacuc, Revue Biblique, Paris, 1899, pp. 133-140. He thinks Habakkuk 3 is divided into strophes, antistrophes, and alternating strophes. He regards vv. 2-3a as a strophe; 3b-5 as an antistrophe; 6-13 as an alternating strophe. However, he would have 7-8a follow v. 10, and 8b-9a follow v 12. Another strophe is formed by vv. 14-16; another antistrophe is vv. 17-19.

Cobb, W. H.---A Criticism of Systems of Hebrew Metre, Oxford, 1905. This is one of the fullest and most illuminating discussions of Hebrew metre in the English language. In his Introduction the author outlines the plan of his study. In ch. I he proceeds by the "Inductive method" to arrive at the principles which should govern in the determination of Hebrew metre. Then follows an exhaustive review and criticism of the various systems proposed, from Bishop Lowth to Eduard Sievers.

Cornill, C. H.---Einleitung in die Kanonischen Bücher des Alten Testaments, Tübingen, 1913, pp. 204f. Cornill accepts Budde's view with reference to chs. 1 and 2 and thinks ch. 3 a psalm.

Einleitung in das Neue Testament, Freiburg, 1896. Here he takes the same position.

The Prophets of Israel:---a translation from Der Isr. Prophetismus by S. F. Corkran, Chicago, 1913. pp. 78-79. The same position is taken here as above.

Carpenter---The Bible in the 19th Century, New York and Bombay, 1903, p. 54f. This work is an illuminating discussion of the history of the criticism of the O. T.

Creelman, H.---An Introduction to the Old Testament, New York, 1917, pp. 163ff. Professor Greelman accepts the view of most modern scholars that the book is not a unity. He thinks 1:12-2:20 is composed of exilic and post-exilic sections. Ch. 3 belongs to a later date than the time of Habakkuk.

Darmesteter, Ars.---Les Gloses. Francaises de Raschi dans la Bible, Petits prophetes, Revue des Etudes Juives, Jan. 1908, Paris, p. 79f.

Davidson A. B.---The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah in the Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, Cambridge, 1905, pp. 45-95. The first 18 pages are devoted to an introduction in which is discussed the personality of the prophet, his prophecy, its integrity, and a summary of the contents of the book. Herein is contained a trenchant criticism of Budde's position.

Delitzsch, Francis---De Habacuci Prophetae Vita atque Aetate, Leipsig, 1842. Here may be found a very full collection of the legends concerning Habakkuk and a critical estimate of their value.

Der. Prophet Habakuk, Leipsig, 1843. There the author takes the position that the book of Habakkuk is a unity, and dates it in the reign of Josiah.

Messianic Prophecies, Eng. translation by S. I. Curtiss, 1891, pp. 171f. In this book written many years later, Delitzsch takes the view that it was written before the battle of Carchemish, probably about 606 B. C.

Messianische Weisagungen, Leipzig, 1899, p. 136. Here he thinks it was written during the reign of Manasseh.

Driver, S. R.---Habakkuk in H. B. D., vol. II, pp. 269-272.

Driver follows Davidson in rejecting the hypothesis of Budde; regards chs. 1 and 2 as a unity; ch. 3 as probably an independent psalm; and dates chs. 1 and 2 shortly before 600 B. C.

Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Book of Samuel, London, 1913, p. 158f. A comment on the word הַוָּה found in Hab. 2:5.

The Minor Prophets: Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi in the Century Bible, New York (American Branch), 1906, pp. 49-110. Here he takes the same position as above. We have, in addition, his annotations on the text.

Introduction to the Literature of the O. T., New York, 1914, pp. 337-340.

Duhm, Bernhard---Das Buch Habakuk, Tübingen, 1906. Here we have one of the most radical treatments of the book ever written. He holds that the book is a unity and composed of six distinct poems. In order to justify his metrical scheme he deals very severely with the text. He thinks the foreign oppressor is not the Chaldean, but the Greeks under Alexander the Great.

Die Theologie der Propheten, Bonn, 1875. Here he took the position that Habakkuk was a disciple of Isaiah. The book was written after the reign of Josiah.

Ewald, Heinrich---Die Propheten des Alten Bundes, vol II, Stuttgart, 1868. He thinks the book a unity, and that the whole constitutes a dramatic poem.

Eiselen, F. C.---Commentary on the O.T., vol. IX, The Minor Prophets, New York, 1907, pp 463-504. The first seventeen pages are devoted to an introduction; the rest of the section deals with annotations. He accepts the view that the prophet teaches that the sin of Judah is to be punished by the

Chaldeans, who in turn will suffer severe punishment. He would date it shortly before 600 B. C.

Eichhorn, J. G.---Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Göttingen, 1824, vol. IV, pp. 399-414. He thinks the book a unity, and dates it about the fourth year of Jehoiakim, 604 B. C.

Farrar, F. W.---Men of the Bible: The Minor Prophets, pp.159-174. He regards the book as a unity, including ch. 3. He would date it about 609-598 B. C., during the reign of Jehoiakim.

Gautier, L.---Introduction a L'Ancien Testament, vol. I, Lausanne, 1914, pp. 510-515f. In his view ch. 3 is no part of the prophecy but a psalm which has served in the liturgical services. Chs. 1 and 2 were composed by the same author, but not at the same date.

Giesebrecht---Beiträge Zur Jesaia Kritik, Gottingen, 1890, pp. 196-198. He held that 1:5-10 was a separate oracle and preceded 1:2-4. 1:5-10 was pre-exilic; the rest was written during the Exile.

Goeje, J. De---Beoordeling van der Prophet Hab. von J. de Gumpach, in Nieuwe Jaarboeken voor Weten-schappelijke Theologie, IV ed. deel, 1861, pp. 304-319. He followed Von Gumpach in regarding the book as composed of two oracles, but left it an open question as to who the invader was.

Gumpach, J. von---Der Prophet Habakuk, München, 1860. Gumpach was the first to advance the idea that we have here two oracles. He thought one told of the invasion of the Scythians; the other of the deliverance of the Jews. Both sections were written by the same author, about 625 B. C.

Gray, G. B.---A Critical Introduction to the O. T., New York, 1908, pp. 221-225. Professor Gray thinks 1:5-10, and whatever else goes with it was written after the battle of Garchemish. He is not clear, however, as to the date of ch. 2:5-19.

Halevy, J.---Habacuc, in Revue Semitique, Paris, 1906, pp. 97-108, 193-212, 289-303. Halevy regards the book as a unity and written during the Chaldean period. In 1:9b he would emend the text as follows:

סְגֻמַּ(א)ת פְּנֵיהֶם סְלַחְמָה

"The movement of their face is for war" on the basis of Gen. 24:17. Another Article in the Revue, 1907, pp. 1-26, is an unsparing criticism of the theory advanced by Duhm in his book, "Das Buch Habakuk, written in 1906.

Happel, O.---Das Buch des Propheten Habakuk, Wurzburg, 1900. A book of 70 pages containing an introduction, translation, and commentary. He holds that the historical background of the book is not the Chaldean invasion. That is to be found in the post-exilic period. The book is eschatological in character, and written about the end of the Maccabean period.

Hirsch, E. G.---Articles, Habakkuk and Book of Habakkuk, in Jewish Encyclopedia, VI., New York, 1904, pp. 117f. This author thinks the book a unity, and with Betteridge, would date it about 701 B. C.

Hitzig, F.---Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, Leipzig, 1881, pp. 267-294. Hitzig regarded the book a unity and written during the reign of Jehoiakim, about 604 B. C. (Chs. 1 and 2 written in 604; ch. 3 a little later.)

Hoonacker, A. Van.---Les Douze Petits Prophetes, Paris, 1908, pp. 453-497. Hoonacker would date it between 605 and 600 B.C., and thinks that ch. 3 has a common origin with chs. 1 and 2. He thinks that originally 1:5-11 preceded 1:2-4, being a divine proclmation; later it was brought into the body of the prophecy.

Houtsma, M. Th.---Habakuk II, v. 4 en 5 verbetered, in Theologisch Tijdschrift, Leiden, 1885, pp. 180-183. He would read עֲפָלָה as an accusative of termination. In 2:5 instead of "The wine" he would read הַדַּד "The tyrant".

Henderson, E.---The Book of the Twelve Minor Prophets, Boston, Gould and Lincoln, 1860, pp. 285-319. He believes the book a unity, and that it was written during the reign of Jehoiachin, 608-604 B. C.

Kirkpatrick, A. F.---Doctrine of the Prophets, 3rd edition, pp. 269-290. He thinks the book a unity even to ch. 3. He further thinks it the result of meditations and communings stretched over a long period.

Keil and Delitzsch---Commentary on the Minor Prophets (Eng. Trans.), Art. Habakkuk, pp. 49ff. Originally from Biblischer Kommentar Über die 12 Kleinen Propheten, Habakkuk, Leipsic, 1888, by C. F. Keil. According to this author there can be no doubt as to the unity of the book; and the attempt to interpret the threat of judgment in ch. 2 by applying it to particular historical persons has utterly failed.

Knudson, A. C.---Beacon Lights of Prophecy, New York, 1914, Reprinted July, 1914, Oct. 1916, p. 28-55ff. Here we have a discriminating discussion on the "Nature of Prophecy".

While the idea of the prediction, in the view of the author, can not be eliminated from a correct conception of prophecy, prediction held a subordinate place in prophecy. According to the O. T. the prophet was primarily a speaker for God. It was his function to declare to men the divine will and purpose. This helps us to arrive at the view that Habakkuk's reference to the Chaldeans did not necessarily precede their coming. He was to make clear the divine purpose in their coming.

Kuenen, A.---Prophets and Prophecy in Israel, Eng. Trans. by Milry, London, 1877, pp. 100, 137, 173f. Originally, "De profeten en de profetie onder Israel: Histor. dogmat. Studie", 2 vols. Leiden, 1875. Kuenen would date Habakkuk before the fall of Jerusalem, even chs. 2 and 3.

The Religion of Israel, Eng. trans. by May, London, 1874, 1875, vol. II, pp. 64-69, Publishers, Williams and Norgate. Originally, "De Godsdienst van Israel tot den ondergang van den Joodschen staat", Haarlem, 1869-1870. Here he takes the view that the book was written immediately after Carchemish (604 B. C.), or not long after Jehoiachin's removal (597 B. C.).

Kent, C. F.---Student's O. T. vol. III, pp.3-21, Sermons, Epistles, and Apocalypses of Israel's Prophets. Here the author discusses Semitic Poetry in general and Hebrew poetry in particular. Chas. Scribner's and Sons, Pub. Co., New York, 1918.

Kittel, R.---A History of the Hebrews, Eng. trans. by Taylor, 1895, London. Used here vol. II, p. 386-395. Originally Geschichte der Hebraer, 1888-1892. In this volume we have given the details of the fall of Jerusalem.

Kautzsch, E.---Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, Freiburg und Leipzig, 1894. He thinks Habakkuk wrote between 623 and 586 B. C. It is difficult to decide as to the date. Also an Outline of the History of the Literature of the O.T., translated by John Taylor, New York, 1899, pp. 74-76.

Kelly, F. T.---The Strophic Structure of Habakkuk, in American Journal of Semitic Languages, Chicago, vol. XVII, Jan. 1902, pp. 94-119. Kelly feels that Budde's view presents fewer difficulties, although he prefers not to be so definite with regard to the identity of the oppressor. His study is of great value in that he makes a strophical arrangement of the book.

König, E.---Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Bonn, 1893, pp. 349f. Konig believes the book is a unity and written after Carchemish. The oppressors in 1:2-4 were the Chaldeans.

Kuper.---Das Prophetentum des Alten Bundes, Leipzig, 1870, pp. 298-300. He thinks the book a unity and written during the reign of Manasseh.

Kuenen, A.---Historisch-Critisch Ondezock Naar het Onstaan en de Verzameling van de boeken des Ouden Verbonds, II, Leiden, 1889, p. 386-395. Here Kuenen holds to the unity of 1:2-2:8 only. These were written near the close of the 7th Century B. C. 2:9-20 and ch. 3 are post-exilic.

Knudson, A. C.---The Religious Teaching of the O. T., New York, 1918, pp. 277-280. Professor Knudson accepts the common view that the book was written about 600 B. C., although he thinks it possible for it to have been written during the exile. Habakkuk's book marked the "beginning of speculation in Israel."

Lauterburg, M.---Meili's Theologische Zeitschrift Aus der Schweiz, Zürich, 1896, p. 74-102. Lauterburg regards the work as post-exilic and thinks the invaders were not Chaldeans, but Persians.

Loeb, Isadore---La Litterature des Pauvres dans la Bible, Paris, 1892, pp. 247-252, 258ff. Ch. 3 is an Epic Psalm. This is evident from such external signs as שִׁגְיֹנוֹת, תְּפִלָּה, and סֶלָה.

Lowth, R.---Lectures on Hebrew Poetry. Trans. by Gregory, p. 309ff. It was Bishop Lowth who in 1753, first discovered the secret of indicating rhythm in Hebrew poetry. He called the phenomenon he discovered the "Parallelism of members".

MacCurdy, J. F.---"Prophets" in Jewish Encyclopedia, vol X, New York, 1905, p. 215. This author thinks the book was written about 600 B. C. He accepts the traditional conception.

Marti, K.---Das Dodekapropheton, Habakkuk, Tübingen, 1904, pp. 326-356. Marti thinks we have (1) a couple of psalmody measures (1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4) which unite to form one psalm, (2) a couple of prophetic segments (1:5-10, 14ff and 2:5-19. It is his view, further, that 1:5-10, 14ff was written about 604 B.C.; and that 2:5-19 was written about 540 B.C.

Moulton,---Expository Times, London, Feb. 1907, pp. 227-228. An answer to the radical view of B. Duhm. This author rejects Duhm's view, and expresses the opinion that it will do much to lead to a renewed consideration of the view advanced by Davidson.

Mueller, D. H.---Strophenbau Und Responsion, Wien, 1898, p. 36-39. The writer here suggests that ch. 3 is poetry and proceeds to give a strophical arrangement of it. According to him there

Lauterburg, M.---Wellh.'s Theologische Zeitschrift Aus der Schule,
Zurich, 1886, p. 74-102. Lauterburg regards the work as post-
exilic and thinks the invaders were not Chaldeans, but
Persians.

Loeb, Isadore---La Litterature des Pauvres dans la Bible, Paris,
1892, pp. 247-252, 2881. Ch. 3 is an Epic Psalm. This is
evident from such external signs as [illegible] and rhyme.

Lowth, R.---Lectures on Hebrew Poetry. Trans. by Gregory, p. 2021
It was Bishop Lowth who in 1753, first discovered the secret of
indicating rhythm in Hebrew poetry. He called the phenomenon
he discovered the "Parallelism of members".

MacCurdy, J. F.---"Prophets" in Jewish Encyclopedia, vol X, New
York, 1905, p. 216. This author thinks the book was written
about 600 B. C. He accepts the traditional conception.

Marti, K.---Das Dodekapropheton, Hakkakuk, Tubingen, 1904, pp. 330-
336. Marti thinks we have (1) a couple of peanody means as
(1:2-4, 12a, 12, 2:1-4) which unite to form one psalm, (2) a
couple of prophetic segments (1:5-10, 14ff and 2:8-19. It is
his view, further, that 1:5-10, 14ff was written about 304 B.C.
and that 2:8-19 was written about 540 B.C.

Moulton,---Expository Times, London, Feb. 1907, pp. 207-208. An
answer to the radical view of S. Duhm. This author rejects
Duhm's view, and expresses the opinion that it will do much to
lead to a renewed consideration of the view advanced by
Davidson.

Mueller, D. H.---Strophenbau Und Responsion, Wien, 1889, p. 80-82.
The writer here suggests that ch. 3 is poetry and proceeds to
give a strophical arrangement of it. According to him there

there are 6 strophes of 7 lines each.

Nestle, E. B.---Das Lied Habakkuks Und der Psalter, in Zeitschrift fur Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen, 1900, pp. 167f. This author takes the view that 3:19 begins a new Psalm.

Nowack, W.---"Die Kleinen Propheten," Göttingen, 1897, pp. 247-273. Nowack thinks the book is not a unity. In his view it is not possible to understand 1:5ff. in the present arrangement of the book. The book in its present arrangement was not written by Habakkuk who wrote about 605 B. C., but was written by an earlier prophet about 610 B. C. Ch. 3 he thinks is post-exilic.

Oort, H.---Theologisch Tijdschrift, XXV., Leiden, 1891, pp. 357-367. He regards the book as a unity, even to ch. 3. He thinks the book dealt successively and simultaneously with the fall of the despots on the inside and the tyrants on the outside. It dates from the reign of Jehoiakim.

Oraelli, C. Von---The O. T. Prophecy, Trans. by J. S. Banks, Edinburgh, 1885, pp. 323f. He thinks the book of Habakkuk was written during the reign of Jehoiakim 609-599 B. C. He holds also to the unity of the book.

Peake, A. S.---The Problem of Suffering in the O. T., London, 1904, pp. 151-171. He accepts Giesebrecht's view that 1:5-11 is pre-exilic, while 1:2-4, 1:12-2:4 originated in the exile about 560-550 B. C. Ch. 3 is pre-exilic. Incidentally this author gives a most illuminating discussion of the problem of suffering in the O. T.

Nicolandot, Firmin,---La Composition Du Livre D'Habacuc, 1908. One of the latest and best discussions of the problems in the book

of Habakkuk. He thinks the book is not a unity. There are two prophecies and two psalms. The first prophecy (1:5-10, 14-17) belongs to the 7th Century B. C. The first psalm (1:2-4, 13, 2:4) between the 5th and 3rd Century B. C.; Ch. 3 probably in the 4th Century. It is his view that it was made a section of the Psalter in the 3rd Century and became a portion of our book in the same Century.

Pusey, E. B.---The Minor Prophets, New York, 1886, vol II, pp. 165-223. Pusey regards the book as a unity and dates it in the latter half of Manasseh's reign, about 645 B. C. He has no sympathy with the methods of modern critical scholarship.

Paton, L. B.---The Early History of Syria and Palestine, New York, 1901, pp. 245-254. Here is told in detail the effort of Merodach-baladan, a Chaldean prince, to revolt successfully against the Assyrian empire. A knowledge of this history is necessary to appreciate the times in which Habakkuk lived and the background of his ministry.

Peiser, F. E.---Der Prophet Habakuk, Berlin, 1903. This is a most unique view of the prophet Habakkuk, and the circumstances of the composition of the book. Peiser thinks the book was composed at Nineveh by a Jewish captive prince, a descendant of one of Israel's kings, and who himself hoped to benefit by the downfall of the invaders of his country. He would date it about 609 B. C.

Piepenbring, C.---Histoire du peuple d'Israel, Paris, 1898, pp. 423-426. This author thinks ch. 3 is a psalm of later date. 1:5-11; 2:12-14 and 2:18-20 are interpretations. The rest was written near the end of the reign of Jehoiakim.

Pertiz, I. J.---O. T. History, New York, 1915, p. 210. Here we have a statement of the fundamental teachings of the book, to the effect that it predicts the ultimate downfall of Babylon. The author thinks ch. 3 belongs to a later age.

Peters, J. P.---The Religion of the Hebrews, Boston and London, 1914. This is a finely written book and most helpful in the matter of Israel's theology and Habakkuk's contribution to it.

Reinke, L.---Der Prophet Habakuk, Brixen, 1870. A book of 170 pages in which the author discusses the life and times of the prophet, the contents of, and critical views touching the book. One of the most complete bibliographies on the subject to be found anywhere.

Renan, E.---Histoire du peuple d'Israel, III, Paris, 1891, pp. 177, 293-296, 307. Renan takes the view that Jeremiah and Habakkuk were contemporaries, and that Habakkuk was superior to Jeremiah. The several parts of the prophecy were composed by Habakkuk at different times.

Ruben, P.---Strophic Forms in the Bible, in Jewish Quarterly Review, vol XI, London, 1899, pp. 448-455. According to this author the enemy who is referred to as having been humbled in 2:4 is Egypt, and the reference is to Carchemish. Ch. 3 is exilic. It is retrospective to the destruction that had already befallen the oppressors of the Jews (vv 12-14), and anticipates a state of complete national happiness.

Robinson, H. W.---The Religious Ideas of the O. T., New York, 1915, pp. 51-70, 159-206. Here we have a stimulating and suggestive treatment of Israel's theological ideas.

Rothstein, J. W.---Ueber Habakuk I and II in Theologische Studien

Pfeiffer, R. H.---O. T. History, New York, 1912, p. 210. Here we have a statement of the fundamental teachings of the book, to the effect that it predicts the ultimate downfall of Babylon. The author thinks on. 3 belongs to a later age.

Peters, J. P.---The Religion of the Hebrews, Boston and London, 1914. This is a finely written book and most helpful in the matter of Israel's theology and Habakkuk's contribution to it.

Reinke, L.---Der Prophet Habakuk, Münster, 1870. A book of 170 pages in which the author discusses the life and times of the prophet, the contents of, and critical views touching the book. One of the most complete bibliographies on the subject to be found anywhere.

Renan, E.---Histoire du peuple d'Israel, III, Paris, 1891, pp. 177, 293-296, 307. Renan takes the view that Jeremiah and Habakkuk were contemporaries, and that Habakkuk was superior to Jeremiah. The several parts of the prophecy were composed by Habakkuk at different times.

Ruben, P.---Strophic Forms in the Bible, in Jewish Quarterly Review, vol XI, London, 1899, pp. 442-456. According to this author the enemy who is referred to as having been humbled in 2:4 is Egypt, and the reference is to Carchemish. Ch. 3 is exilic. It is retrospective to the destruction that had already befallen the oppressors of the Jews (vv 13-14), and anticipates a state of complete national happiness.

Robinson, H. W.---The Religious Ideas of the O. T., New York, 1913, pp. 81-90, 199-206. Here we have a stimulating and suggestive treatment of Israel's theological ideas.

Rothstein, G. W.---Ueber Habakuk I und II in Theologische Studien

Und Kritiken, Gotha, 1898, pp. 51-85. Rothstein criticises the "Assyrian theory" of Budde and offers another in its stead. He thinks we have in the book of Habakkuk an old oracle against the wickedness of the people "worked Over" into an oracle against the Chaldeans.

Smith, G. A.---The Book of the Twelve Prophets, London, 1903, vol II, pp. 113-159. George Adams Smith accepts Budde's view that 1:5-11 should follow 2:4, but it is not so certain whether the foreign foe described is the Assyrian or Egyptian. He thinks ch. 3 is an independent psalm.

Stevenson, W. B.---Habakkuk, in the Expositor, London, 1902, vol. V, pp. 388-400. He thinks ch. 1 falls into four sections: 2-4, 5-11, 12-13, 14-17. By transposing 12-13 an older arrangement is restored in which there are only two sections: 2-4 plus 12-13 and 5-11 plus 14-17.

Sievers, Edward---Metrische Studien, Leipzig, 1901, p.490f. Here will be found metrical arrangement of ch. 1.

Strack, H.---Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Müchen, 1906, pp. 117f. This author thinks the book is a unity and was written between 605 and 601 B. C. According to him the Chaldeans were the oppressors in 1:2-4.

Stade, B.---Habakkuk, in Zeitschrift fur Altestamentliche Wissenschaft, Giessen, 1884, pp. 154-159. Stade thinks we have a unity in 1:2-2:8. 2:9f. suggests a Palestinian tyrant, and ch. 3 is a post-exilic Psalm.

Stonehouse, G. G. V.---The Book of Habakkuk, London, 1911. It is the view of this author that the crux of the section 1:1-2:1 is to be found in 1:5, 6a. Here the original has been worked

Smith, G. A.---The Book of the Twelve Prophets, London, 1903, vol. I
pp. 113-139. George Adam Smith accepts Budde's view that
1:5-11 should follow 2:4, but it is not so certain whether the
foreign foe described is the Assyrian or Egyptian. He thinks
ch. 3 is an independent psalm.

Stevenson, W. B.---Habakkuk, in the Expositor, London, 1902, vol. V
pp. 388-400. He thinks ch. 1 falls into four sections: 2-4,
5-11, 12-13, 14-17. By transposing 12-13 an older arrangement
is restored in which there are only two sections: 2-4 plus
12-13 and 5-11 plus 14-17.

Sievers, Midwrd---Metrische Studien, Leipzig, 1901, p.490f. More
will be found metrical arrangement of ch. 1.

Strack, H.---Einleitung in das Alte Testament, München, 1903, pp.
117f. This author thinks the book is a unity and was written
between 600 and 001 B. C. According to him the Chaldeans were
the oppressors in 1:2-4.

Stade, B.---Habakkuk, in Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissen-
schaft, Giessen, 1884, pp. 154-159. Stade thinks we have a
unity in 1:2-2:8. 2:9f. suggests a Palestinian tyrant, and
ch. 3 is a post-exilic Psalm.

Sweenburne, C. C. V.---The Book of Habakkuk, London, 1911. It is
the view of this author that the crux of the section 1:1-2:1 i
to be found in 1:8, 8a. Here the original has been worked

over to suit the purpose the editor had in mind. Perhaps the author's greatest contribution to the subject is his systematic arrangement of the various critical theories touching the book.

Smit, G.---De Profetie van Habakuk, Utrecht, 1900, p. 107. He reviews the principal works on the subject and gives a Commentary. He regards the book as a unity and dates it between 625 and 601 B. C.

Smith, H. P.---O. T. History, New York, 1917, p. 285. The prophet is depicted as sighing over the problems of his time. The author dates the book about 598 B. C., or a few years earlier.

Volck, W.---In the New Schaff-Herzog, Religious Encyclopedia, vol. V., p. 105, New York and London, 1909. This author regards the book as a unity and would date it shortly before the battle of Carchemish.

Volz, P.---Habakuk, in Theologischer Jahresbericht, 1906, p. 148. Here is given a brief discussion and criticism of the work of Bernard Duhm's book (Das Buch Hab.)

Wellhausen, J.---Die Kleinen Propheten, Berlin, 1898, pp. 33-37, translation; 165-173 Critical notes. Wellhausen thinks 1:5-11 is an older oracle that has been interpolated, and would remove it altogether. 1:2-4 plus 1:12-2:4 treats of the Chaldean oppression. In 2:5 a new development is begun against the Chaldeans. Ch. 3 is a psalm, and was not written by Habakkuk.

Wildboer, G.---Die Litteratur des Alten Testaments, Göttingen, 1895, p. 224-228. The first section (1:2-2:8) was written between 600 and 597 B. C. and 2:9f does not refer to the Chaldeans but to others. Ch. 3 is a Psalm, written earlier than 200 B. C.

Ward, W. H.---Habakkuk, In International Critical Commentary, New York, 1911. This author dates chs. 1 and 2 about 600 B. C. during the reign of Jehoiakim. Ch. 3 is a separate production, arranged for temple worship, and may or may not be by one of the authors to whom we owe 1:12-2:20.

Robinson, H. W.---Habakkuk in Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition, vol. XII, p. 782f. He thinks it impossible to maintain the unity of chs. 1 and 2. For that reason he regards Marti's solution as the most probable.

The Works of Josephus, translated by Wm. Whiston, Philadelphia, 1859, vol. II, pp. 251-257. Here Josephus describes the coming of Alexander the Great to Judea. This seems to be a refutation of the view taken by Duhm to the effect that the Macedonians under Alexander were the foreign oppressors of the Jews, rather than that the Chaldeans were.

The Apocrypha.---The Story of Bel and the Dragon.

Thomas, C.---Handbuch der Geschicte des Alten und Neuen Bundes, I, 1897, pp. 360f. This author thinks chs. 1 and 2 were written by Habakkuk between 604 and 601 B. C. Ch. 3 is a psalm from a later date.

Gigot, F. E.---Art. Habakkuk, in Catholic Encyclopedia, p. 9ff. He thinks the most probable date is 605-600 B. C. However, the date of ch. 3 cannot be determined with certainty.

Gordon, A. R.---The Prophets of the O. T. London, 1916, pp. 243-251. Professor Gordon thinks 1:2-11, and the original nucleus of the "woes" in ch. 2, are a fragment from an older prophecy, written about 608 B. C. The genuine prophecy of Habakkuk was written about 560-550 B. C. Ch. 3 is an independ-

ent Psalm from a late Jewish collection.

Goodspeed, G. S.---A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians, New York, 1913, pp. 323-347. Here is found a vivid description of the last days of the Assyrian empire, and the most brilliant period of the Babylonian empire under Nebuchadrezzar.

Calvin, John.---Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets (Eng. trans.), Art. Habakkuk, pp. 1-24ff. He was not certain as to the date, either under Manasseh, or under the kings preceding Zedekiah, probably during the reign of Jehoiakim, 606-598 B. C.

Other Necessary Books.

Biblia Hebraica, Kittel (Nowack, editor Minor Prophets), Leipzig, 1906.

The O. T. in Greek, According to the Septuagint, edited by H. B. Swete, III, Cambridge, 1905.

Gesenius Hebrew Grammar, Kautzsch, Translated by A. E. Crowley, Oxford, 1910.

OUTLINE OF DISSERTATION

Preface.

Bibliography.

I. Historical Introduction.
1. The Prophet Habakkuk.
Name and personal history.
Habakkuk according to Tradition and Legend.

2. The Book of Habakkuk and the Main Difficulties connected with its Interpretation.
Summary of Contents in chs. 1:2-2:4.
Summary of Contents in ch. 2:5-20.
Summary of Contents in ch. 3.
The "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:2-4.
The description of the Chaldeans in ch. 1:5-11.
The "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:13.
The Authenticity of ch. 2:9-20.
The Authenticity of ch. 3.

3. The History of the Critical Study of the Book of Habakkuk.
The two periods of the history of Bible Study.
The influence of the Reformation on the study of the Bible.
Habakkuk from the viewpoint of the scholarship of the Reformation.
Beginnings of Old Testament Criticism.
Early Critical views touching Habakkuk: Eichhorn, DeWette, Ewald, Delitzsch, Friedrich, Raintz, Hitzig, Maurer, Bleek.
The Critical study of Habakkuk since 1860:
Von Gumpach's work and its importance.
Various Theories Classified.
The Two Oracle Theory.
Gumpach's arrangement of the book.
De Goeje's " " " "
Giesebrecht's " " " "
Wellhausen's " " " "
Nowack's " " " "
Peake's " " " "
Criticism of this theory.
The Composite or Fragmentary Theory.
Stevenson's hypothesis and criticism of it.
Marti's " " " " "
Nicolardot's " " " " "
The Reconstructive Theory.
Budde's hypothesis and criticism of it.
G. A. Smith's " " " " "
Van Hoonacker's " " " " "
The Redactional Theory.
Rothstein's hypothesis and criticism of it.
Interpretative Theories.
Betteridge's hypothesis and criticism of it.

OUTLINE OF DISSERTATION

Preface.

Bibliography.

I. Historical Introduction.
1. The Prophet Habakkuk.
Name and personal history.
Habakkuk according to Tradition and Legend.

2. The Book of Habakkuk and the Main Difficulties connected with its Interpretation.
Summary of Contents in ch. 1:2-2:4.
Summary of Contents in ch. 2:5-20.
Summary of Contents in ch. 3.
The "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:2-4.
The description of the Chaldeans in ch. 1:5-11.
The "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:13.
The Authenticity of ch. 2:5-20.
The Authenticity of ch. 3.

3. The History of the Critical Study of the Book of Habakkuk.
The two periods of the History of Bible Study.
The influence of the Reformation on the study of the Bible.
Habakkuk from the viewpoint of the scholarship of the Reformation.
Beginnings of Old Testament Criticism.
Early Critical views touching Habakkuk: Storborn, Doederlein, Ewald, Delitzsch, Pridgeon, Prince, Rittenberg, Maurer, Block.
The Critical study of Habakkuk since 1880:
Von Gumpach's work and its importance.
Various Theories Classified.
The Two Oracle Theory.
Gumpach's arrangement of the book.
" " " "
De Goeje's " " "
Giesebrecht's " " "
Wellhausen's " " "
Nowack's " " "
Peake's " " "
Criticism of this theory.
The Composite or Fragmentary Theory.
Stevenson's hypothesis and criticism of it
Marti's " " " "
Nicolardot's " " " "
The Reconstructive Theory.
Budde's hypothesis and criticism of it.
G. A. Smith's " " " "
Van Hoonacker's " " " "
The Redactional Theory.
Rothstein's hypothesis and criticism of it
Interpretative Theories.
Betteridge's hypothesis and criticism of it

Peiser's hypothesis and criticism of it.
Duhm's " " " " "
Stonehouse's " " " " "
Davidson's " " " " "
Concluding statement touching criticism of the various Theories.

II.
1. The Most Satisfactory Solution of the Critical Problems of the Book, other than the date.
The "wicked" and "righteous" in 1:2-4 and 1:13.
The connection between 1:5-11 and 1:2-4.
Discussion of the authenticity of ch. 2:9-20.
Reasons for doubting authenticity of ch. 3.

2. The Date of Habakkuk and Interpretation of the Book.
Difficulties in this connection--various views.
Written during the Chaldean period--general agreement here.
History of this period.
The internal evidence and its bearing on the date.
Reasons for the writer's view that the book was written shortly after the fall of Jerusalem (586-585 B. C.)
Comparison of times described by Ezekiel with conditions in ch. 1:2-4.
Bearing of 1:5-11 and 1:12-17 on this late date.
Reconciling this late date with the idea of "prediction" in prophecy.
Additional evidence showing Habakkuk to have been a contemporary of Ezekiel.
The interpretation of the book in the light of our date.

III. Translation based on a metrical arrangement of the Hebrew text. In addition to the translation there will be found here notes on the difficult passages.

IV. Reconstruction of the Hebrew Text.
1. A Brief Discussion of the Forms of Hebrew Poetry.

2. The Poetic Form of Habakkuk.

3. The Reconstructed Text.
First section 1:2-2:4 with notes.
Second section 2:5-20 with notes.
Third section 3:1-19 with notes.

V. The Place of Habakkuk in the History of Hebrew Thought.
1. The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament and Habakkuk's Contribution to it.
The view of suffering in early Israel.
Among the 8th Century prophets.
Jeremiah and Ezekiel.

Post-exilic writers: Deutero-Isaiah, Job, Psalm 73.
Habakkuk's contribution to the solution of the problem.

2. The Apocalyptic Hope in the Old Testament and Habakkuk's Contribution to it.
The evidences of an eschatology in the earliest times.
The pre-prophetic period.
"The Day of Yahweh."
The popular tradition.
The criticism of Amos
Three stages in the development of the prophetic conception of the day of Yahweh.
The pre-exilic view from Amos to Zephaniah and contribution of Zephaniah.
Exile and Period of Restoration. Isa. 13, Deutero-Isaiah, Psalms 93, 99, Haggai, Zech. 1-8, 14.
Israel, a state, in danger of backsliding (Mal. chs. 3:2ff; 4:5f).
The Coming of the Ideal Kingdom.
The Personal Messiah.
Habakkuk's view of the Apocalyptic Hope.

3. The Conception of God in the Old Testament.
The view prior to the time of Moses.
The contribution of Moses.
The period of the Judges.
The period of the Monarchy.
The Prophetic period.
Habakkuk's conception of God.

VI. Conclusion.
A summary of the fundamental propositions in the dissertation.

I. HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

Chapter I.

THE PROPHET HABAKKUK.

I. HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

Chapter I.

THE MOUNT MARION.

INTRODUCTION

a. Name and Personal History.

One of the most interesting, and at the same time, most baffling problems in connection with the study of the book of Habakkuk, is that touching the personality of the author of the book. Who was he? When and where did he live? What were his peculiar individual characteristics, which, doubtless were largely responsible for giving his book its unique place in the Old Testament literature?

How valuable such a knowledge of the prophet's personality is, is clearly demonstrated in the case of the fuller appreciation, in our day, of those prophets whose personal life and characteristics we know most about. Especially would such a knowledge be necessary for an age which has accepted as its guide in this matter of the inspiration of Biblical writers, Immanuel Kant's conception of the Constitutive Activity of thought, viz: "The human mind is not the passive recipient of a ready-made knowledge. It receives from without certain stimuli, and then out of them builds up for itself its own world."

The acceptance of this principle means the endorsement of the view that each prophet, although acting under the direction and influence of the Divine Spirit, is not bereft of his own personality in the transmission of the Divine message to others. On the contrary, this message is worked over in the prophet's own mind, and is "shot through and through" with his own peculiar type of thinking and method of expression. This makes it necessary, we repeat, to know as much as possible of the personal

INTRODUCTION

A. Name and Personal History.

One of the most interesting, and at the same time, most baffling problems in connection with the study of the book of Habakkuk, is that touching the personality of the author of the book. Who was he? When and where did he live? What were his peculiar individual characteristics, which, doubtless were largely responsible for giving his book its unique place in the Old Testament literature?

How valuable such a knowledge of the prophet's personality is, is clearly demonstrated in the case of the fuller appreciation, in our day, of those prophets who's personal life and characteristics we know most about. Especially would such a knowledge be necessary for an age which has accepted as its guide in this matter of the inspiration of Biblical writers, Immanuel Kant's conception of the Constitutive Activity of thought, viz: "The human mind is not the passive recipient of a ready-made knowledge. It receives from without certain stimuli, and then out of them builds up for itself its own world."

The acceptance of this principle means the endorsement of the view that each prophet, although acting under the direction and influence of the Divine Spirit, is not bereft of his own personality in the transmission of the Divine message to others. On the contrary, this message is worked over in the prophet's own mind, and is "shot through and through" with his own peculiar type of thinking and method of expression. This makes it necessary, we repeat, to know as much as possible of the personal

history of the Biblical writers, if we are to interpret, correctly, their writings.

It would, therefore, seem the part of wisdom to begin our study of this remarkable little book of Habakkuk with an examination of the material dealing with the personal history of the prophet.

The name Habakkuk is found only in the book bearing the prophet's name, and there is considerable uncertainty as to its meaning. However, it seems to come from the verb חָבַק "to clasp, to embrace". It is found in Genesis 29:13 where Laban ran to meet Jacob and "embraced" (יְחַבֵּק) him; again in 2nd Kings 4:16 where Elisha told the Shunammite woman that at a certain time she would "embrace" חֹבֶקֶת a son. In the LXX it appears in the form Ἀμβακοὺμ. The Greek form of the name would suggest that it was formerly pronounced חַבַּקּוּק . The presence of the μ before the β suggests that the β was doubled, and following the Greek practice, μ was substituted for one of the β's for the sake of euphony. It is not so easy to explain how the κ at the end of the word was changed to μ but probably this change also was made on the ground of euphony. In his article "Habakkuk" in the Encyclopedia Britannica (9th Edition, p. 319), W. L. Alexander compares the changes in our word to that in the case of the change of "Beelzebub" to "Beelzebul". This change, he thinks, was due to the Greek dislike to have a final syllable begin and end with the same rough consonant. (See also Driver, Art. Habakkuk", H.B.D., vol. 2, 269).

Other meanings have been given for the name. According to Farrar (Men of the Bible---Minor Prophets, p. 159) Jerome defined it as "wrestler" (Luctator fortis et rigidus), while Luther took

it to mean: "one who presses to the heart".

One of the most interesting and unusual meanings given for the name is that which connects it with the Assyrian "Hambakku", the name of a garden plant in Assyria (H.B.D. vol. 2, p. 269, Art. Hab.). It was largely on the basis of this connection that Peiser (See Introduction p, 17) concluded that Habakkuk was a captive prince trained in Assyrian learning at Nineveh. Nothing is known with certainty of the personal life of Habakkuk. In the scriptures no reference is made to him except in the 1st and 3rd chapters of his book. In ch. 1:1 we have the statement: "The burden which Habakkuk the prophet did see". In ch. 3:1 we have as the title or superscription of the Psalm: "A Prayer of Habakkuk the prophet, set to Shigionoth." These two passages give the inference that he held a recognized position as a prophet, but where he lived and when, we are not given a hint. One other possible reference to him is made. In ch. 3:19 we have what purports to be a personal note from the author of the book (or the Psalm as the case may be). It is as follows: "For the Chief Musician on my stringed instruments." This some take to mean that Habakkuk was officially qualified to take part in the liturgical singing of the temple and therefore belonged to one of the Levitical families, who were charged with the maintenance of the temple music, and like the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel, who sprang from priestly households, belonged to the tribe of Levi (Keil and Delitzsch, Com. on the Minor Prophets, Eng. trans. p. 49 ff). However, Driver (Art. Hab., HBD. vol. 2, p. 269) thinks it doubtful both on account of the uncertainty attaching to the pronoun "my" which is against the analogy of other similar

notices, and also on account of the doubt (supposing the pronoun to be correct) whether at this time the singers were necessarily Levites.

b. Habakkuk according to Tradition and Legend.

While little is given us in the Old Testament about the life of Habakkuk, Jewish Hagaddah had much to tell of him. First there is the popular tradition concerning the prophet. In the Jewish Chronicle "Seder Olam Zuta", we are told that Joel, Nahum, and Habakkuk prophesied during the reign of Manasseh, but because Manasseh was not upright, his name was not prefixed to their prophecies.

This tradition was accepted by most of the early Church his torians. For example Syncellus, a Christian author, testified that Habakkuk was a prophet during the reign of Manasseh, and that his life was prolonged as a prophet in Judah, while Ezekiel prophesied in Babylon.

However, Augustine was not strongly impressed with the testimony of these apocryphal writers. In De Civita. Dei XVIII, 31, he says that three of the Minor prophets, Obadiah, Nahum, and Habakkuk, neither speak themselves concerning their day, nor is it found in the Chronicles of Eusebius and Jerome when they prophesied.

But the most prolific source of information concerning the prophet, although, and at the same time, the least reliable, is that type of the Hagaddah known as the legend. Most of these legends are fantastic and can make no appeal to the scientific thought of our day, but they have value in the indication they give of the place held in tradition by our hero. It is a

tendency of succeeding ages to weave a halo around the memory of a popular hero and to so surround him with legend as to make him almost a mythical character. And the fact that we have so many legends concerning Habakkuk makes it evident that he had a great hold on the popular imagination.

For a full discussion and criticism of these legends see Delitzsch's "De Habacuci Vita atque Aetate", also Baumgartner's "Le Prophete Habakkuk."

One of the legends makes him a watchman and associate of Isaiah. Another characterizes him as the son of the Shunammite woman, "At this season when the time cometh around, thou shalt embrace a child". The word for embrace there is חֹבֶקֶת. This, it is claimed, is from the same root as the name of the Prophet. In the Codex Chisianus of the LXX, the story of Bel and the Dragon is prefaced by the words ἐκ προφητείας ἀμβακοὺμ υἱοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Λευεί.

From this it is seen that the prophet was spoken of as the son of Jesus (Joshua or Jeshua), of the tribe of Levi. He was probably thought to be of the tribe of Levi because of the expression in 3:19, "On my stringed instruments."

But the most widely diffused legend about Habakkuk is that found in the story of Bel and the Dragon (Bel and the Dragon, Apocrypha vv 33f.). It is the story of Habakkuk the Dishbearer. According to this story the prophet, while carrying pottage to his reapers, was suddenly directed by an angel to carry it to Daniel, who had been cast the second time by Cyrus into the lions' den in Babylon. When Habakkuk was given the mission by the angel, he replied he had never seen Babylon and did not know about the

den of lions. The angel seized Habakkuk by the hairs of the head, and taking him to Babylon, placed him in front of the den. Habakkuk lifted his voice and said: "Daniel, Daniel, take this nourishment which God has sent you." Daniel said: "Thou dost remember me, O God, and thou has not abandoned those who love thee." Then Daniel lifted himself up and ate, and the angel transported Habakkuk back to his own country.

As was said above, this legend was widespread, being found in the Greek versions of the LXX and of Theodotion, the Code of Chisianus, the Midrashim, the Mohammedan traditions, and among the early church fathers and historians. Some have added certain features, others have abridged, but in the main, the legend remains the same.

This fantastic legend, dressed in its shade of magic, and representing the quintessence of bad taste, is effectually disposed of by Baumgartner (Le Prophete Habakkuk p. 14f). It could not do other than "grate on the nerves" of a scientific age like our own.

Chapter II.

THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK AND THE MAIN DIFFICULTIES CONNECTED WITH ITS INTERPRETATION.

Chapter II.

THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK AND THE MAIN DIFFICULTIES CONNECTED WITH ITS INTERPRETATION.

But our difficulties do not end with the personal history of the prophet. They are, if anything, increased as we study, and attempt to interpret, his book.

The book of Habakkuk consists of three chapters which divide themselves into three sections. First, chs. 1:2-2:4 (Verse 1 gives the title of the book). Here ensues a dialogue between the prophet and Yahweh as to the wrong and violence that obtain all around him. Second, ch. 2:5-20, a series of woes that are to come upon the evil-doer whose god is his might. Third, ch. 3, an ode setting forth the wonderful work of Yahweh through the years.

I. Ch. 1:2-2:4.

This section opens with a series of questions, addressed by Habakkuk to Yahweh. He wants to know how long he (Habakkuk) shall cry and Yahweh will not hear. How long must he cry out concerning violence and Yahweh will not save. Destruction and violence are before him, and there is strife and contention. Justice does not obtain in the administration of the law and the wicked encompass the righteous. The prophet cannot understand why such conditions should exist with a righteous God whom he regards as supreme in the universe. These questionings on the part of the prophet are set forth in vv. 2-4.

In vv. 5-11 we have Yahweh's answer. Yahweh is not unmindful of conditions to which the prophet referred and even in the prophet's own days was doing a marvelous thing to change those conditions. He was raising up the Chaldeans as his instrument of punishment for the wickedness of which Habakkuk complained. The Chaldeans were fully competent for the given task which Yahweh had assigned them. They were a bitter and hasty nation who made

a specialty of taking possession of lands and dwelling-places that did not belong to them, except by the right of conquest. They were terrible and dreadful themselves, while their horses were swifter than leopards, and both keenly enjoyed their bloody work. The strongest fortifications of any enemy gave them no concern whatever. They scoffed at enemy kings and made sport of their princes. Their face was set ever forward and they gathered captives as the sand. With them right was might, and might was the only God they had.

This answer on the part of Yahweh raised a greater problem in the mind of the prophet--greater because it concerned the character of Yahweh himself in the view of the prophet. He wants to know now how can Yahweh, who is so pure that he cannot behold evil, choose such a people as the Chaldeans, as his instrument for the punishment of a people more righteous than they. He then arraigns the Chaldeans mercilessly. They make men as the fishes of the sea, as the creeping things that have no ruler over them. They are utterly devoid of humanitarian instincts. They take fiendish delight in the torture and slaughter of helpless victims. Shall such a nation be allowed to continue indefinitely its career of frightfulness and ruthlessness? This response of the prophet is found in vv. 12-17.

In v. 1 of ch. 2 the prophet announces that he is going to place himself upon his watch-tower to see what answer Yahweh will make to his complaint. In vv. 2-4 we have Yahweh's answer. First, he requested that his answer be written on tablets so plainly that even a man running might read it. For the message that Yahweh was about to give him would surely come to pass. Indeed, it was

already rapidly approaching. The prophet must not be discouraged if it seemed to tarry. He was simply to wait for it, for it would surely come. And this was the vision he saw, the message of comfort he was to give to those who looked to him for help. The soul of the Chaldean is puffed up in him. His triumphs are temporary. He has in himself the root of his own downfall--his self-conceit. Only the righteous shall live and that by his faith.

II. Ch. 2:5-20.

This response on the part of Yahweh is followed by a series of "woes" against the Chaldean tyrant, or whoever the tyrant referred to above was.

Accepting these verses as authentic, the complete destruction of the oppressor is predicted, and with him his gods, which in reality are no Gods. In striking contrast to this is set forth the universality of Yahweh's reign.

III. Ch. 3.

In Chapter 3 we have an ode setting forth the work of Yahweh through the years. This ode is ascribed to Habakkuk by its title. There is, however, considerable question as to its authenticity and the majority of critics are of the opinion that Habakkuk was not the author.

First we have a prayer that Yahweh would revive his great work in the midst of the years. The petitioner, however, is afraid of Yahweh, and would have him, "in wrath remember mercy".

In vv. 3-15 the writer discusses, brilliantly, events in the life of Israel which set forth the manifestations of Yahweh's power among them. Yahweh came from Teman. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. His bright-

ness was as the light. However, there was another side to him. Before him went the pestilence and fiery bolts went forth at his feet. He stood and measured the earth; he beheld and drove asunder the nations. Before him all nature trembled.

Was it Yahweh's displeasure with nature that caused him to manifest himself as he did? Whatever the reason the fact remains that Yahweh gave a memorable manifestation of himself in nature. The mountain and the sea, and the heavens all saw him and were afraid at the light of his arrows as they went and at the shining of his glittering spear.

Yahweh continued his triumphal march for the salvation of his people, for the salvation of his anointed.

In v. 16 the poet's body trembled and his lips quivered because he must wait quietly for the day of trouble. As he looks forward into the future, he notes that there shall be a very general failure on the part of nature to function normally-- the fig-tree shall not flourish and the fields shall yield no fruit--, and yet he rejoices that Yahweh is his strength. No harm can come to him with such a protector. Yahweh will make his feet like hinds' feet.

MAIN DIFFICULTIES CONNECTED WITH THE INTERPRETATION.

The problems in the book of Habakkuk which give critical scholarship the greatest concern are: first, the "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:2-4; second, the Chaldeans in 1:5-11 are referred to in such a way as not to be easily understood; third,

near was as the light. However, there was another side to him.
Before him went the pestilence and fiery bolts went forth at his
feet. He stood and measured the earth; he beheld and drove
asunder the nations. Before him all nature trembled.

Was it Habakkuk's disclosure with nature that caused him to
mumble at himself as he did? Whatever the reason the fact remains
that Habakkuk gave a memorable manifestation of himself in nature.
The mountain and the sea, and the heavens all saw him and were
afraid at the light of his arrows as they went and at the shining
of his glittering spear.

Habakkuk continued his triumphal march for the salvation of
his people, for the salvation of his anointed.

In v. 16 the poet's body trembled and his lips quivered be-
cause he must wait quietly for the day of trouble. As he looks
forward into the future, he notes that there shall be a very
general failure on the part of nature to function normally-- the
fig-tree shall not flourish and the fields shall yield no fruit--,
and yet he rejoices that Yahweh is his strength. He is the one
to him with such a protector. Yahweh will make his feet like
hinds' feet.

MAIN DIFFICULTIES CONNECTED WITH THE INTERPRETATION.

The problems in the book of Habakkuk which give critical
scholarship the greatest concern are: first, the "wicked" and
"righteous" in ch. 1:2-4; second, the Chaldeans in 1:5-11 are
referred to in such a way as not to be easily understood; third,

the identity of the "wicked" and "righteous" in 1:13, and their relation to those in 1:2-4; fourth, the authenticity of ch. 2:9-20; fifth, the authenticity of ch. 3; sixth, the date of the prophecy.

In ch. 1:2-4 the prophet complains to Yahweh of the destruction and violence that are before him. There is strife, and contention arises. The Torah is slacked, and justice is perverted. All of this is due to the fact that the "wicked" encompass the "righteous". Our problem is to identify the "wicked" and the "righteous".

A number of scholars take the view that these undesirable conditions were due to the unjust treatment accorded the lower class of Jews by their more favored countrymen. These latter, because of their oppression of their countrymen, were the "wicked", while their victims were the "righteous". Thus Davidson (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, p. 47) says: "This is the most natural sense of the verses and of the words used in them."

But as both Davidson and Driver (The New Century Bible--Minor Prophets, p. 55) recognized, the view advanced above does not relieve the difficulties in the interpretation of the book. If in 1:5-11 the Chaldean is to be raised up to punish the wrong-doing prevalent in Judah, why is he to be punished by Yahweh for playing his role as Yahweh's rod of chastisement?

In order to meet this difficulty some other scholars deny that these undesirable conditions are due to any wickedness on the part of the Jews themselves, but to the oppression of a foreign tyrant. It is their view that the "righteous" refers to Israel as

a whole; the "wicked" to a foreign oppressor.

Those critics who assert that 1:2-4 refer to a foreign oppressor, are forced to the conclusion that vv. 1:5-11 are out of place where they are, because in 1:5 the Chaldeans are about to be raised up for the first time, although, according to these scholars, their violence has just been described in 1:2-4. Thus Giesebrecht would have vv. 5-11 precede 1:2-4; Wellhausen would remove it altogether, regarding it as an older passage than the rest, and not written by Habakkuk; while Budde and G. A. Smith would have it follow 2,4.

Another difficulty is the way the Chaldeans are described in 1:5-11. In vv. 5,6 there is the suggestion that their being "raised up" is a matter of the future. The inference being that they are Yahweh's answer to the prophet's complaint in 1:2-4. In vv. 7-11, however, a different situation is suggested. The Chaldeans, who, the reader is told in vv. 5,6, are about to be raised up, seem already familiar to people who in the preceding verses were being told about them as if they were entire strangers.

Another problem has to do with the identity of the "wicked" and "righteous" in 1:13. Are the "wicked" and "righteous" here identical with those in 1:2-4, or are they different? According to the ordinary interpretation of 1:2-4, the "wicked" and "righteous" are two classes of Jews in Judah. Regarding these as identical in 1:2-4 and 1:13, and keeping in mind the scathing arraignment of the "wicked" in 1:12-17, one does not see how such an arraignment could be made of any class of Jews. Further, the people described in 1:12-17 are very clearly the same people described in 1:5-11 who seem to be the Chaldeans.

On the view that the "wicked" and "righteous" in both sections are the Chaldeans and Israel respectively, one is at a loss to know how the Chaldeans in 1:5-11 could be raised up to punish themselves. And so "the plot thickens".

Another difficulty is the question of the authenticity of 2:9-20. A number of scholars hold that the genuine prophecy of Habakkuk goes no further than 2:8. For example Kuenen (Historisch--Criticish Onderzoek naar het Onstaan en de Verzameling van de baeken des Ouden Verbonds, II, Leiden, 1889, p. 386-395) holds to the unity of 1:2-2:8 only.

Other scholars, like Wellhausen, think that 2:9-20 were written by Habakkuk, and refer to the Chaldeans, but that some passages such as vv. 8b and 17b are unsuitable where they stand at present.

Another problem usually raised in connection with the integrity of the book of Habakkuk, is that touching the authenticity of ch. 3. Was this chapter written by Habakkuk, or does it come from a later hand? Was it originally a unity with chs. 1, and 2, or were the two sections put together by an editor, many years later?[1]

With reference to these questions there is considerable difference of opinion among scholars; and these various opinions we propose to discuss at length in a subsequent chapter.

1 - The question of date will be discussed in a subsequent chapter.

Chapter III.

THE HISTORY OF THE CRITICAL STUDY OF THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK.

Chapter III.

THE HISTORY OF THE CRITICAL STUDY OF THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK.

In the previous chapter, attention was directed to the problems connected with the book of Habakkuk. It is these problems and difficulties that have gripped and held the interest of both ancient and modern scholarship for the past twenty centuries. But in view of the fact that the science of Biblical Criticism is of comparatively recent origin, the history of the critical study of the book of Habakkuk must of necessity be limited to the literature of this field produced since Biblical Criticism came to be recognized as a science.

As a matter of fact, the literature dealing with the critical study of the book of Habakkuk may be divided into two distinct groups: (1) that written prior to 1860, or by men who, although writing later, were still under the influence of the earlier viewpoint; (2) that written since 1860 by men who were influenced, to some extent, by the work of Von Gumpach. We now turn to the study of the literature of both of these periods.

The history of Bible study may be divided into two periods, the age of tradition and the age of criticism. The age of tradition held sway down to the time of the Reformation. During this period there were three assumptions that largely dominated Biblical study. These were the infallibility of scripture, the allegorical method of interpretation, and the principle of the absolute authority of the Church.

It was against this last that Martin Luther made his great fight and won. Incidentally, the allegorical method of interpretation was rejected along with the principle of papal authority; but the principle of the infallibility of Scripture

In the previous chapter, attention was directed to the problems connected with the book of Habakkuk. It is these problems and difficulties that have gripped and held the interest of both ancient and modern scholarship for the past twenty centuries. But in view of the fact that the science of Biblical Criticism is of comparatively recent origin, the history of the critical study of the book of Habakkuk must of necessity be limited to the literature of this field produced since Biblical Criticism came to be recognized as a science.

As a matter of fact, the literature dealing with the critical study of the book of Habakkuk may be divided into two distinct groups: (1) that written prior to 1880, or by men who, although writing later, were still under the influence of the earlier viewpoint; (2) that written since 1880 by men who were influenced, to some extent, by the work of Von Gumpach. We now turn to the study of the literature of both of these periods.

The history of Bible study may be divided into two periods, the age of tradition and the age of criticism. The age of tradition held away down to the time of the Reformation. During this period there were three assumptions that largely dominated Biblical study. These were the infallibility of scripture, the allegorical method of interpretation, and the principle of the absolute authority of the Church.

It was against this last that Martin Luther made his great fight and won. Incidentally, the allegorical method of interpretation was rejected along with the principle of papal authority; but the principle of the infallibility of Scripture

remained, and the scholars of the Reformation devoted themselves assiduously to a mastery of the text of the Bible in order that they might be sure to get the exact message of what they now regarded as their absolute authority.

The scholars of the Reformation, however, made little or no attempt at Biblical criticism. Their revolt was against the view of the absolute authority of the Church. To justify their revolt against the Church they had to establish infallibility and authority elsewhere. So their aim was to establish the authority of the scriptures and to prove that they were the infallible guide for Christian conduct. The burden of their efforts was to put the common people into possession of the Word itself. This was the crying need of their day, and nobly did they address themselves to it. Thus while we find many volumes from the pen of the great leader of the Reformation, Martin Luther, we find nothing suggestive of modern critical methods.

The following from Calvin with reference to Habakkuk is typical of the Biblical scholarship of that day: "The date of Habakkuk is uncertain. He seems to have prophesied either under Manasseh, or under the other kings before the time of Zedekiah, probably between 606 and 598 B. C.[1]

The history of Old Testament criticism may be said to have begun with Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677).[2] He outlined the program of modern Biblical study; denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; and, in several matters of detail, anticipated

1 - Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets, Trans. from the Latin, by Jno. Owens, vol. 4, 1848. -2- In his Tractus Theologico - Politicus, puhlished posthumously, in 1677.

remained, and the scholars of the Reformation devoted themselves assiduously to a mastery of the text of the Bible in order that they might be sure to get the exact message of what they now regarded as their absolute authority.

The scholars of the Reformation, however, made little or no attempt at Biblical criticism. Their revolt was against the view of the absolute authority of the Church. To justify their revolt against the Church they had to establish infallibility and authority elsewhere. So their aim was to establish the authority of the scriptures and to prove that they were the infallible guide for Christian conduct. The burden of their efforts was to put the common people into possession of the Word itself. This was the crying need of their day, and nobly did they address themselves to it. Thus while we find many volumes from the pen of the great leader of the Reformation, Martin Luther, we find nothing suggestive of modern critical methods.

The following from Calvin with reference to Habakkuk is typical of the Biblical scholarship of that day: "The date of Habakkuk is uncertain. He seems to have prophesied either under Manasseh, or under the other kings before the time of Zedekiah, probably between 606 and 598 B. C.[1]

The history of Old Testament criticism may be said to have begun with Benedict de Spinoza (1632-1677).[2] He outlined the program of modern Biblical study; denied the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch; and, in several matters of detail, anticipated

1 - Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets, Trans. from the Latin, by Jno. Owens, vol. 4, 1849. -2- In his Tractus Theologico - Politicus, published posthumously, in 1677.

the conclusions of modern scholarship.

Spinoza was followed by Richard Simon (1638-1712)[1]. Simon developed the theory that the Hebrews were not unlike other Oriental nations in having official historiographers. This was characteristic of all the nations of the East. The fundamental difference between the Hebrew writers and those of other nations being, that the Hebrew writers were inspired, while those of other nations were not. Simon did not present much that was new, so far as the matter itself was concerned, but his genuine historical spirit and method were new, and marked an epoch in the history of the study of the Bible.

After these men came Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827). He was the first to apply the name "higher criticism" to the analyses of the Biblical books into their later and earlier elements. He was also the first to write a comprehensive introduction to the Old Testament from this new point of view. Because of his conception of the true aim of literary and historical inquiry, as well as by the wide range of his learning, Eichhorn became known as the real founder of Old Testament criticism.

Other notable names in the history of Old Testament Criticism are Martin Lebrecht De Wette (1780-1849), Heinrich Ewald (1803-1875), Wilhelm Vatke (1806-1882), Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891), and Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918).

While most of the labor of the scholars named above was expended on the documents of the Pentateuch, it was inevitable that the same method and spirit of historical inquiry should be

1 - Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament.

the conclusions of modern scholarship.

Spinoza was followed by Richard Simon (1638-1712)[1]. Simon developed the theory that the Hebrews were not unlike other Oriental nations in having official historiographers. This was characteristic of all the nations of the East. The fundamental difference between the Hebrew writers and those of other nations being, that the Hebrew writers were inspired, while those of other nations were not. Simon did not present much that was new, so far as the matter itself was concerned, but his genuine historical spirit and method were new, and marked an epoch in the history of the study of the Bible.

After these men came Johann Gottfried Eichhorn (1752-1827). He was the first to apply the name "higher criticism" to the analyses of the Biblical books into their later and earlier elements. He was also the first to write a comprehensive introduction to the Old Testament from this new point of view. Because of his conception of the true aim of literary and historical inquiry, as well as by the wide range of his learning, Eichhorn became known as the real founder of Old Testament criticism.

Other notable names in the history of Old Testament Criticism are Martin Lebrecht De Wette (1780-1849), Heinrich Ewald (1803-1875), Wilhelm Vatke (1806-1882), Abraham Kuenen (1828-1891), and Julius Wellhausen (1844-1918).

While most of the labor of the scholars named above was expended on the documents of the Pentateuch, it was inevitable that the same method and spirit of historical inquiry should be

1 - Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament.

applied to the other books of the Old Testament; and it was not long before this was done.

Early Critical Views Touching Habakkuk.

It is interesting in this connection to note the views of the earliest and most prominent Old Testament critics concerning the Book of Habakkuk. For the most part they regarded the book as a unity, and as written by the prophet whose name it bears.

For example, Eichhorn[1] says: "Nobody could well doubt that Habakkuk had elaborated and committed to writing this beautiful piece of work." He thinks, however, that allowance must be made for poetic speech and prophetic poetry. He regards the book as a unity, and to have been written in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, 604 B. C.

De Wette[2], writing of Habakkuk, said: "Habakkuk lived and prophesied in the Chaldean period, but it is doubtful and contested in what part of the period we should place him. Ch. 1:5ff certainly refers to the beginning of it, and belongs to the reign of Jehoiakim, 610-599 B. C. Even the last chapter does not appear to demand a later date, for he has no misgivings of the destruction of Judah (3:16-17); consequently he was a younger contemporary of Jeremiah."

1 - Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Göttingen, 1824, vol. 4, pp. 398-414.

2 - Einleitung in Alten Testament, trans. by Theodore Parker, Boston, in 1843, p. 463f.

applied to the other books of the Old Testament; and it was not long before this was done.

Early Critical Views Touching Habakkuk.

It is interesting in this connection to note the views of the earliest and most prominent Old Testament critics concerning the Book of Habakkuk. For the most part they regarded the book as a unity, and as written by the prophet whose name it bears. For example, Eichhorn[1] says: "Nobody could well doubt that Habakkuk had elaborated and committed to writing this beautiful piece of work." He thinks, however, that allowance must be made for poetic speech and prophetic poetry. He regards the book as a unity, and to have been written in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, 604 B. C.

De Wette[2], writing of Habakkuk, said: "Habakkuk lived and prophesied in the Chaldean period, but it is doubtful and contested in what part of the period we should place him. Ch. I:5ff certainly refers to the beginning of it, and belongs to the reign of Jehoiakim, 610-599 B. C. Even the last chapter does not appear to demand a later date, for he has no misgivings of the destruction of Judah (3:16-17); consequently he was a younger contemporary of Jeremiah."

1 - Einleitung in das Alte Testament, Göttingen, 1824, vol. 4, pp. 396-414.

2 - Einleitung in Alten Testament, trans. by Theodore Parker, Boston, in 1843, p. 463f.

The scholar, who, unquestionably, made the largest contribution, prior to 1860, to our knowledge concerning Habakkuk and the book attributed to him, was Franz Delitzsch. His first book[1], published in 1842, is a fine collection and criticism of the numerous legends concerning Habakkuk. In 1843, in a second book[2], he took the position that the book of Habakkuk was a unity, and was written during the reign of Josiah. In a third book[3], published in 1899, Delitzsch expressed the view that the book of Habakkuk was a unity and written during the reign of Manasseh.

Another of the early Old Testament critics who regarded the book a unity was Heinrich Ewald[4]. He thinks we have here a drama divided into three parts. The whole drama could hardly be performed in Jerusalem, but ch. 3, he held, is so arranged that it could be performed in the temple; and if Habakkuk was a priest (which Ewald thought was probable), there is a great probability that ch. 3 was actually performed in public. In his view the book is a unity, and he would date it in the reign of Jehoiakim, 605-597 B. C.

Hitzig[5] regarded the book a unity, and dated it during the reign of Jehoiakim; chs. 1 and 2 in 604 B. C.; ch. 3, a little later.

1 - De Habacuci Prophetae Vita Atque Aetate, Lips., 1842.

2 - Der Prophet Habakkuk, 1843.

3 - Messianische Weissagungen, Leipzig, 1899, p. 136.

4 - Prophets of the Old Testament, vol. III, translated by J. Frederick Smith, 1878, pp. 27-48.

5 - Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, Leipzig, 1852.

The scholar, who, unquestionably, made the largest contribution, prior to 1800, to our knowledge concerning Habakkuk and the book attributed to him, was Franz Delitzsch. His first book[1], published in 1842, is a fine collection and criticism of the numerous legends concerning Habakkuk. In 1843, in a second book[2], he took the position that the book of Habakkuk was a unity, and was written during the reign of Josiah. In a third book[3], published in 1890, Delitzsch expressed the view that the book of Habakkuk was a unity and written during the reign of Manasseh.

Another of the early Old Testament critics who regarded the book a unity was Heinrich Ewald[4]. He thinks we have here a drama divided into three parts. The whole drama could hardly be performed in Jerusalem, but ch. 3, he held, is so arranged that it could be performed in the temple; and if Habakkuk was a priest (which Ewald thought was probable), there is a great probability that ch. 3 was actually performed in public. In his view the book is a unity, and he would date it in the reign of Jehoiakim, 608-597 B. C.

Hitzig[5] regarded the book a unity, and dated it during the reign of Jehoiakim; che. 1 and 2 in 604 B. C.; ch. 3, a little later.

1 - De Habacuci Prophetae Vita Atque Aetate, Lipsiae, 1842.

2 - Der Prophet Habakkuk, 1843.

3 - Messianische Weissagungen, Leipzig, 1890, p. 136.

4 - Prophets of the Old Testament, vol. III, translated by J. Frederick Smith, 1878, pp. 27-48.

5 - Die Zwölf Kleinen Propheten, Leipzig, 1852.

Maurer[1] thought ch. 1 was written 605, and chs. 2 and 3 in 604 B. C.

As was intimated at the beginning of this discussion, most of the earlier critics accepted the traditional conception of the unity and authenticity of the Book of Habakkuk. This view of the unity of the book, however, was not shared by all even of the earliest critics. Carriere[2] refers to certain critics "Who would divide the book into fragments". One of these to whom he referred was J. C. Friedrich[3]. Friedrich held that the book ought to be divided into four parts: the oldest part being ch. 3:1-15, which Friedrich regarded as depicting a victory of Jehoiakim against the Midianites, a victory of which history makes no mention. The second part, in his opinion, was formed by 1:5-17 and 3:16-19. It was published after the fall of Jerusalem. The third, 1:2-4, dated from the reign of Zedekiah; and the fourth, ch. 2, was the latest of all. It was written during the Exile and just before the death of Habakkuk.

Another of the earlier critical scholars who dared to differ somewhat from the traditional conception of the book of Habakkuk was Aug. Car. Ranitz[4]. Ranitz insisted that the book was divided

1 - Comment Gram-histor-crit. in Proph. Minores, Lips. 1840.

2 - Etude Historique et Critique sur l'epoque de la Prophetie d' Habakuk, Strasbourg, 1864, p. 20f.

3 - Historische-Kritischer Versuch Ueber Habakuks Zeitalter und Schriften, in the Allgemeinen Bibliothek dr bibl. literatur, published by J. C. Eichhorn X., 379f.

4 - Introductio in Habacuci Vaticinia, Lips, 1808.

Maurer[1] thought ch. 1 was written 605, and chs. 2 and 3 in 604 B. C.

As was intimated at the beginning of this discussion, most of the earlier critics accepted the traditional conception of the unity and authentiolty of the Book of Habakkuk. This view of the unity of the book, however, was not shared by all even of the earliest critics. Carpzov[2] refers to certain critics "Who would divide the book into fragments". One of these to whom he refered was J. C. Friedrich[3]. Friedrich held that the book ought to be divided into four parts: the oldest part being ch. 3:1-15, which Friedrich regarded as depicting a victory of Jehoiakim against the Midianites, a victory of which history makes no mention. The second part, in his opinion, was formed by 1:5-17 and 3:16-19. It was published after the fall of Jerusalem. The third, 1:2-4, dated from the reign of Zedekiah; and the fourth, ch. 2, was the latest of all. It was written during the Exile and just before the death of Habakkuk.

Another of the earlier critical scholars who dared to differ somewhat from the traditional conception of the book of Habakkuk was Aug. Chr. Hanita[4]. Hanita insisted that the book was divided

1 - Comment Gram-histor-crit. in Proph. Minores, Lipe. 1840.

2 - Etude Historique et Critique sur l'epoque de la Prophetie d' Habakuk, Strasbourg, 1864, p. 207.

3 - Historische-Kritischer Versuch Ueber Habakuks Zeitalter und Schriften, in the Allgemeinen Bibliothek dr bibl. Literatur, published by J. C. Eichhorn X., 1793.

4 - Introductio in Habacuci Vaticinia, Lipe, 1808.

into three parts, each being published at a different date: ch. 1: 1-5 under Jehoiakim; ch. 1:6-2:20 under Jehoiachin; ch. 3 under Zedekiah.

Our brief survey of the field of critical scholarship, in the first half of the last century, as it had to do with the interpretation of the book of Habakkuk, reveals the following: While here and there might be found an occasional writer who doubted the unity, if not the authenticity of the book, there was practically no change from the traditional view of the book of Habakkuk, down to the middle of the 19th century. At this time it was still very generally believed that the book was written by the prophet whose name it bears; that it was a unity; and that it should be dated anywhere from the reign of Manasseh to the reign of Zedekiah.

The Critical Study of the Book of Habakkuk Since 1860.

As was noted above, prior to 1860, the traditional conception of the book of Habakkuk was almost universally accepted, even by the critical scholarship of that period. There were those who thought different parts of the book were written at different dates, but nobody questioned either the authenticity of the book or its present arrangement. All the chapters were thought to be the work of the prophet whose name the book bears. In 1860, however, a different arrangement of the book was proposed, and the authenticity of some verses was called into question. The scholar who first proposed this different arrangement was J. Von Gumpach, a German scholar, in a book[1] published in 1860. Not many critics accepted

1 - Der Prophet Habakkuk.

I - Der Prophet Habakkuk.

his view of the prophecy; nor was it made the basis for later work on the subject, except by a Dutch scholar, De Goeji. Von Gumpach's book was important only from the fact that, in his analysis of the book of Habakkuk, he dared to break away from the beaten path. He was the first, really to assume a critical attitude toward the study of the book. Since that time many and varied theories have been set forth in connection with the book. It is these several theories which we propose to study, and to criticize, at this time. Stonehouse[1] has made a classification of these various views which we shall use as the basis of our study in this investigation. They are as follows: (1) The Two Oracle Theory; (2) The Fragmentary or Composite Theory; (3) The Reconstructive Theory; (4) The Redactional Theory; (5) Interpretative Theories.

In our investigation of these theories we hope to list each of the most important contributors, in this field, in one of these five classes.

The Two Oracle Theory.

Taking them in the order in which they are listed above, we shall study first, the "Two Oracle Theory".

Von Gumpach may be called the father of the Two Oracle Theory - that is the view that the book is composed of two distinct prophecies which have been put together, by a later editor, as one prophecy.

In a book[2], published in 1852, Gumpach had expressed the

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, f. 66.

2 - Die Zeittrechnung der Babylonier.

his view of the prophecy; nor was it made the basis for later work on the subject, except by a Dutch scholar, De Goeji. Von Gumpach's book was important only from the fact that, in his analysis of the book of Habakkuk, he dared to break away from the beaten path. He was the first, really to assume a critical attitude toward the study of the book. Since that time many and varied theories have been set forth in connection with the book. It is these several theories which we propose to study, and to criticize, at this time. Stonehouse[1] has made a classification of these various views which we shall use as the basis of our study in this investigation. They are as follows: (1) The Two Oracle Theory; (2) The Fragmentary or Composite Theory; (3) The Reconstructive Theory; (4) The Redactional Theory; (5) Interpretative Theories.

In our investigation of these theories we hope to list each of the most important contributors, in this field, in one of these five classes.

The Two Oracle Theory.

Taking them in the order in which they are listed above, we shall study first, the "Two Oracle Theory".

Von Gumpach may be called the father of the Two Oracle Theory - that is the view that the book is composed of two distinct prophecies which have been put together, by a later editor, as one prophecy.

In a book[2], published in 1852, Gumpach had expressed the

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, p. 66.

2 - Die Zeitrechnung der Babylonier.

view that Habakkuk's first prophecy referred, not to the Chaldean, but to a Scythian invasion. In his book published in 1860, of which mention has already been made, he developed his "Scythian invasion theory," further. He based his view, that the Scythians were the oppressors referred to in 1:2-4, on the similarity between Hab. 1:6-11 and Jer. 4:1-6:1. In the latter reference, it will be remembered, the prophet gives a vivid description of the "Foe from the North." From this Gumpach concluded that the book of Habakkuk contained two oracles: the first (1:1-14; 2:1-3; 3:16-17) predicted the invasion of the Scythians; the second (3:1-2; 2:4-20; 3:3-7; 3:15, 8-14, 18, 19) told of the deliverance that would come to the Jews. He held that the word כַּשְׂדִּים which is usually rendered "Chaldeans", was wrongly pointed. The correct reading should be כַּשְׁדִּים which would be rendered "Like the Demons", or "Demon-like". This he thought to be an epithet of the Scythians.[1]

The following year, 1861, De Goeji, a Dutch scholar, set forth much the same view,[2] but left it an open question as to who the foe was. His arrangement was as follows: The first oracle consisted of 1:1-4; 2:1-3; 1:5-11; 3:16, 17. The second oracle consisted of 3:2; 1:12-17; 2:4-20; 3:3-7, 15, 8-14, 18, 19.

In 1890 Giesebrecht gave notice of a rearrangement of the book of Habakkuk[3]. He held that attempts to understand the book

1 - Cf. Stonehouse, The Book of Habakkuk, p. 67, N. 1.

2 - In Nieuwe Jaarboeken Voor Wetenschappelijke, Theologie, IVth, deel, 1861, pp. 304-319.

3 - Beitrage zur Jesiakritik, p. 196 f.

view that Habakkuk's first prophecy referred, not to the Chaldean, but to a Scythian invasion. In his book published in 1800, of which mention has already been made, he developed his "Scythian invasion theory." Further. He based his view, that the Scythians were the oppressors referred to in 1:2-4, on the similarity between Hab. 1:8-11 and Jer. 4:13-31. In the latter reference, it will be remembered, the prophet gives a vivid description of the "Foe from the North." From this Grumpach concluded that the book of Habakkuk contained two oracles: the first (1:1-14; 2:1-3; 3:16-17) predicted the invasion of the Scythians; the second (3:1-2; 2:4-20; 3:3-7; 3:8, 8-14, 18, 19) told of the deliverance that would come to the Jews. He held that the word בדמים which is usually rendered "Chaldeans", was wrongly pointed. The correct reading should be כדמים which would be rendered "Like the Demons", or "Demon-like". This he thought to be an epithet of the Scythians.[1]

The following year, 1861, De Goeij, a Dutch scholar, set forth much the same view,[2] but left it an open question as to who the foe was. His arrangement was as follows: The first oracle consisted of 1:1-4; 2:1-3; 1:5-11; 3:16, 17. The second oracle consisted of 3:2; 1:12-17; 2:4-20; 3:3-7, 15, 8-14, 18, 19.

In 1890 Giesebrecht gave notice of a rearrangement of the book of Habakkuk[3]. He held that attempts to understand the book

1 - Cf. Stonehouse, The Book of Habakkuk, p. 67, N. 1.

2 - In Nieuwe Jaarboeken Voor Wetenschappelijke Theologie, IVth deel, 1861, pp. 304-319.

3 - Beitrage zur Jesaiakritik, p. 196 f.

hitherto had shown an awkwardness in the arrangement of the author's ideas. The author, according to Giesebrecht, dealt with the definition of the "righteous" and the "wicked", and several times placed them over against each other. It is clear in 2:1-6 and in 1:12 ff. that the prophet referred to Israel as the "righteous" and to the Chaldeans as the "wicked". It is at least probable that these terms have the same significance at the beginning of ch. 1. If this be true the wrongs complained of in 1:2-4 must be understood to refer, not to social wrongs in Israel, but to Chaldean oppression. What he wants then is relief from this oppression. In that case, 1:5-11 is clearly out of place, since it announces the coming of the Chaldeans as something new, while the rest of the passage shows that they have been oppressing Judah for some time.

From this Giesebrecht concluded that Habakkuk's original oracle consisted of 1:1-4, 12-17; 2:1-8, 12. This oracle, in his opinion, dated from the time of the Exile. The Oracle 1:5-11 was added later, by the prophet, as an introduction, and placed before 1:1.

This view, in the main, has been accepted by Wellhausen[1] and Nowack[2]; and, more recently, has been advocated by A. S. Peake[3]. Wellhausen and Nowack agree with Giesebrecht that 1:5-11 was not a part of the original oracle, but both regard the original oracle as pre-exilic, and not dating from the time of the Exile.

1 - Die Kleinen Propheten, pp. 165-173.

2 - Die Kleinen Propheten, pp. 247-252.

3 - The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament, pp. 151-171.

hitherto had shown an awkwardness in the arrangement of the author's ideas. The author, according to Giesebrecht, dealt with the definition of the "righteous" and the "wicked", and several times placed them over against each other. It is clear in 2:1-6 and in 1:12 ff. that the prophet referred to Israel as the "righteous" and to the Chaldeans as the "wicked". It is at least probable that these terms have the same significance at the beginning of ch. 1. If this be true the wrongs complained of in 1:2-4 must be understood to refer, not to social wrongs in Israel, but to Chaldean oppression. What he wants then is relief from this oppression. In that case, 1:5-11 is clearly out of place, since it announces the coming of the Chaldeans as something new, while the rest of the passage shows that they have been oppressing Judah for some time.

From this Giesebrecht concluded that Habakkuk's original oracle consisted of 1:1-4, 12-17; 2:1-8, 12. This oracle, in his opinion, dated from the time of the Exile. The Oracle 1:5-11 was added later, by the prophet, as an introduction, and placed before 1:1.

This view, in the main, has been accepted by Wellhausen[1] and Nowack[2]; and, more recently, has been advocated by A. S. Peake[3]. Wellhausen and Nowack agree with Giesebrecht that 1:5-11 was not a part of the original oracle, but both regard the original oracle as pre-exilic, and not dating from the time of the Exile.

1 - Die Kleinen Propheten, pp. 165-173.

2 - Die Kleinen Propheten, pp. 247-252.

3 - The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament, pp. 181-171.

Wellhausen would remove 1:5-11 altogether, because he thinks it was not written by Habakkuk. Nowack, however, regards 1:5-11 as authentic, and would date it about 610 B. C.

In the first place it must be admitted that the question of the relation of 1:2-4, 12-17 to 1:5-11 is a problem of considerable moment; and if the above proposal removed the difficulties in connection with the interpretation, it would be cordially welcomed, if for no other reason than for its simplicity. There are a number of reasons, however, to be urged against the acceptance of this view. In the first place Giesebrecht builds his thesis on the presumption that the terms "righteous" and "wicked" in 1:13 and 1:2-4 mean the same thing. But that does not necessarily follow, for in 1:2-4 the "wicked" seem to be blamed for a "slacked Torah" and "perverted judgment." This evidently points to a people who were familiar with the Torah and subject to its requirements. Again it reduces the original oracle (1:2-4, 1:12-2:4) to very meager dimensions without any hint as to who the oppressor is in 1:12-17 and 2:4, over whom the righteous are ultimately to have victory. Finally 1:5-11, as a separate oracle, would seem to require an occasion for its existence; and to cut it off from its present connection would be to leave it suspended in the air. We would then have a brilliant description of a mighty people, and their expected invasion, without any definite idea as to what land they were invading, nor why they were making the invasion. It is true that Giesebrecht regards 1:5-11 as the introduction to the main oracle, but that does not remove the difficulties in connection with this view. What reason would there be for its having been written, originally, as a separate oracle?

been written, originally, as a separate oracle?

tion with this view. What reason would there be for its having
main oracle, but that does not remove the difficulties in connec-
true that Ginsberg regards I:5-11 as the introduction to the
they were invading, nor why they were making the invasion. It is
their expected invasion, without any definite idea as to what land
would then have a brilliant description of a mighty people, and
present connection would be to leave it suspended in the air. We
require an occasion for its existence; and to cut it off from its
victory. Finally I:5-11, as a separate oracle, would seem to
I:12-17 and 2:4, over whom the righteous are ultimately to have
meager dimensions without any hint as to who the oppressor is in
Again it reduces the original oracle (1:2-4, 1:12-2:4) to very
were familiar with the Torah and subject to its requirements.
and "perverted judgment." This evidently points to a people who
for in 1:2-4 the "wicked" seem to be blamed for a "slacked Torah"
1:2-4 mean the same thing. But that does not necessarily follow,
presumption that the terms "righteous" and "wicked" in 1:13 and
view. In the first place Ginsberg builds his thesis on the
of reasons, however, to be urged against the acceptance of this
for no other reason than for its simplicity. There are a number
nection with the interpretation, it would be cordially welcomed, if
moment; and if the above proposal removed the difficulties in con-
the relation of 1:2-4, 12-17 to 1:5-11 is a problem of considerable

In the first place it must be admitted that the question of
thentic, and would date it about 610 B. C.

not written by Habakkuk. However, regards 1:5-11 as au-

Wellhausen would remove 1:5-11 altogether, because he thinks it was

The Fragmentary Theory.

We study next the Fragmentary, or Composite Theory. This term includes those views which do not regard the book as a literary unity, but as possessing a fragmentary character. The leading exponents of this view are W. B. Stevenson[1], Karl Marti[2], and Firmin Nicolardot[3].

According to Stevenson, ch. 1, as it stands, is composed of four sections: 2-4, 5-11, 12-13, 14-17. He would combine 2-4 and 12-13 and make them one section; he would then combine 5-11 and 14-17 for a second section. The first of these two sections (1:2-4 and 12-13) is a complaint of oppression in which the sufferers are spoken of as the "righteous", and the oppressors as the "wicked". The opporessed suffer violence and iniquity and spoiling. Here we have a description of social conditions within the Jewish community. The second section is a delineation of the character of the Chaldeans and a description of their conquests. As an answer to the view that 14-17 describes a more advanced stage in the conquest than 5-11, he says: "This is probably due to the fact that vv 14-17 are always read in the light of 12-13. At most there is a certain literary progress in the description.

As to the logical and historical connection between the two sections, he says that it is well to remember that the

1 - In Expositor, 1902, pp. 388-400.

2 - Das Dodekapropheton, Habakkuk, 1904, pp. 326-356.

3 - La Composition Du Livre Habacuc.

The Fragmentary Theory.

We study next the Fragmentary, or Composite Theory. This term includes those views which do not regard the book as a literary unity, but as possessing a fragmentary character. The leading exponents of this view are W. R. Stevenson[1], Karl Marti[2], and Firmin Nicolardot[3].

According to Stevenson, ch. I, as it stands, is composed of four sections: 2-4, 5-11, 12-13, 14-17. He would combine 2-4 and 12-13 and make them one section; he would then combine 5-11 and 14-17 for a second section. The first of these two sections (I:2-4 and 12-13) is a complaint of oppression in which the sufferers are spoken of as the "righteous", and the oppressors as the "wicked". The oppressed suffer violence and iniquity and spoiling. Here we have a description of social conditions within the Jewish community. The second section is a delineation of the character of the Chaldeans and a description of their conquests. As an answer to the view that 14-17 describes a more advanced stage in the conquest than 5-11, he says: "This is probably due to the fact that vv 14-17 are always read in the light of 12-13. At most there is a certain literary progress in the description.

As to the logical and historical connection between the two sections, he says that it is well to remember that the

1 - In Expositor, 1902, pp. 388-400.

2 - Das Dodekapropheton, Habakkuk, 1904, pp. 326-336.

3 - La Composition Du Livre Habacuc.

prophetic utterances, both larger and smaller, are mere fragments. We are not, therefore, entitled to assume connection between successive paragraphs, or even between verses, unless the transition is smooth and evident. He consequently concludes that there is no proof that the two sections of ch. 1 are parts of one utterance or composition. They contribute separately to our knowledge of the teaching of the prophet.

In the case of ch. 2, Stevenson takes the view that we have here also two main divisions: (1) The prediction of the overthrow of the Chaldeans or Assyrians (vv 5-8, with 2-4 possibly as a preface). (2) A denunciation of social evils (vv 9-12, 15-17). He thinks neither section is clearly a unit from a literary point of view.

These divisions are unmistakably parallel to the sections of ch. 1, but there are points of contrast also, and we are not entitled to assume literary connection between the chapters.

On this view we have in chs. 1 and 2, four distinct oracles instead of one, all of which are to be thought of as the work of the same author, though written at different dates.

There are several objections to this theory of the composition of the book, in the view of the present writer: (1) It proposes to separate vv 12-13 from 14-17 and unite them with vv 2-4. Whatever may be one's view as to the relation between 2-4 and 1: 12 ff., it seems very clear that 12-17 are a unity. Vv 14-17 are absolutely dependent on 12-13 for a coherence, and 12-17 represent decidedly more than "a certain literary progress" in the description of the Chaldeans. (2) Stevenson holds that there is no necessary logical connection between the two sections

of ch. 1. They simply contribute separately to our knowledge of the teaching of the prophet. He bases his assertion on the fact that we have only fragmentary utterances from the prophets. While this is true, the fact remains that the purpose for which each oracle has been uttered or written is, as a rule, quite intelligible. If this were not true, how could we be sure that we have any distinct coherent message from any particular prophet? (3) What warrant have we for supposing we have two oracles in ch. 2, even if we are disposed to regard some of the verses as later additions, as some scholars do? (4) It is hard to follow the reasoning which arrives at the conclusion, that, although the two sections in ch. 2 are unmistakably parallel to those in ch. 1, were doubtless written by the same author, and are certainly found here together in the same book, we are, nevertheless, not entitled to assume any literary connection between the two chapters.

The view of Stevenson does not seem to have commended itself very highly to other scholars.

Marti makes the following analysis of the book of Habakkuk: (1) a couple of psalmody measures (1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4), which unite to form one Psalm. This Psalm sets forth the Divine answer to the poets's complaint of a domineering kingdom of unrighteousness. According to it, the "wicked" will be destroyed, but the "righteous" will stand. (2) There are a couple of prophetic segments (1:5-1), 14ff.) embodying a prophecy in which the uprising of the Chaldeans, and their entrance into the destiny of even the most remote nations, is proclaimed. (3) Then follows a series of woes (2:5-19) which point to an insatiable conqueror

of ch. 1. They simply contribute separately to our knowledge of
the teaching of the prophet. He bases his assertion on the fact
that we have only fragmentary utterances from the prophets. While
this is true, the fact remains that the purpose for which each
oracle has been uttered or written is, as a rule, quite intelli-
gible. If this were not true, how could we be sure that we have
any distinct coherent message from any particular prophet? (3)
What warrant have we for supposing we have two oracles in ch. 2,
even if we are disposed to regard some of the verses as later ad-
ditions, as some scholars do? (4) It is hard to follow the
reasoning which arrives at the conclusion, that, although the two
sections in ch. 2 are unmistakably parallel to those in ch. 1,
were doubtless written by the same author, and are certainly found
here together in the same book, we are, nevertheless, not entitled
to assume any literary connection between the two chapters.

The view of Stevenson does not seem to have commended it-
self very highly to other scholars.

Marti makes the following analysis of the book of Habakkuk:
(1) a couple of psalmody measures (1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4), which
unite to form one Psalm. This Psalm sets forth the Divine answer
to the poets's complaint of a dominering kingdom of unrighteous-
ness. According to it, the "wicked" will be destroyed, but the
"righteous" will stand. (2) There are a couple of prophetic
segments (1:5-11, 14ff.) embodying a prophecy in which the uprai-
ing of the Chaldeans, and their entrance into the destiny of even
the most remote nations, is proclaimed. (3) Then follows a
series of woes (2:5-19) which point to an insatiable conqueror

who has overrun the nations and has heaped together their possessions. Marti regards the prayer in ch. 3 as a late Psalm in which the appearance of Yahweh for world judgment, and for the deliverance of his people, is set forth with great rhetorical ardor.

Besides the constituent elements named above, Marti thinks there are several detached segments which may be regarded as glosses, due to redactions of the book. These segments are 1:11, 12b, 17; 2:20.

The prophetic element (1:5-10, 14ff.) appears only in the two middle sections. This is the oldest part of the book of Habakkuk, and the only part written by Habakkuk. It should be dated 605 B. C.

In Marti's opinion, the "woes" (2:5-19), which here are directed against the Chaldeans, could not have come from the prophet who proclaimed these same Chaldeans to be the instruments of God. They could not have been written, he thinks, until the Chaldean kingdom was on the decline, about 540 B. C.

Marti has a unique explanation of the present arrangement of the book: The prophetic element was written by Habakkuk about 605 B. C. As the Babylonian Kingdom neared its downfall, another author wrote the "woes". This was about 540 B. C. The author of the "woes" joined them to the prophetic segment, but, in order to make the different judgments of the Chaldeans in 1: 5-10, 14ff. agree, it became necessary to add 1:11, 12b. These two segments (the prophetic and the "woes") were united at the end of the Exile. The book remained in this condition until about the second century B. C., when, due to the fact that the

who is overrun the nations and has heaped together their possessions. Marti regards the prayer in ch. 3 as a late Psalm in which the appearance of Yahweh for world judgment, and for the deliverance of his people, is set forth with great rhetorical ardor.

Besides the constituent elements named above, Marti thinks there are several detached segments which may be regarded as glosses, due to redactions of the book. These segments are 1:11, 12b, 17; 2:20.

The prophetic element (1:5-10, 14ff.) appears only in the two middle sections. This is the oldest part of the book of Habakkuk, and the only part written by Habakkuk. It should be dated 608 B. C.

In Marti's opinion, the "woes" (2:5-19), which here are directed against the Chaldeans, could not have come from the prophet who proclaimed these same Chaldeans to be the instruments of God. They could not have been written, he thinks, until the Chaldean kingdom was on the decline, about 540 B. C.

Marti has a unique explanation of the present arrangement of the book: The prophetic element was written by Habakkuk about 608 B. C. As the Babylonian Kingdom neared its downfall, another author wrote the "woes". This was about 540 B. C. The author of the "woes" joined them to the prophetic segment, but, in order to make the different judgments of the Chaldeans in 1:5-10, 14ff. agree, it became necessary to add 1:11, 12b. These two segments (the prophetic and the "woes") were united at the end of the Exile. The book remained in this condition until about the second century B. C., when, due to the fact that the

prophetic writings began to be thought of as prophecies of the end of the world, the Psalm 1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4 was written on the margin of the book. From there it was transferred to the text, after having been broken up into pieces.

While this view of Marti's is an ingenious one it cannot be said to be very satisfactory. (1) He holds that 1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4 is the union of two psalmody measures to form one psalm, and that this psalm gives the answer to the poet's complaint against a domineering unrighteousness. As Driver says[1], "Marti has undoubtedly succeeded in extracting three consistent and logical wholes; but the dislocation which has to be postulated for no. 3 is too improbable." (2) The "woes" would seem to need an adequate historical occasion and background to bring them into existence. Whatever the excesses of the Chaldeans against other nations in 540 B. C., the Jews in Babylon do not seem to have been unduly oppressed. As a matter of fact the exiles seem to have been more prosperous than their countrymen in the homeland. With this in mind it is not clear how an older prophetic segment, written in 605 B. C., so well fitted the conditions which obtained in 540 B.C., that an author living in the latter period could join together the older prophetic segment and a vitriolic diatribe against the oppressors of his own day, and find them a perfect match, in practically every particular. (3) Nor is his statement that the psalm (1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4) was allowed in the second century B. C. to be written on the margin, and then later inserted into the text, in broken pieces, very convincing.

1 - Century Bible, p. 58ff.

prophetic writings began to be thought of as prophecies of the end of the world, the Psalm 1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4 was written on the margin of the book. From there it was transferred to the text, after having been broken up into pieces.

While this view of Marti's is an ingenious one it cannot be said to be very satisfactory. (1) He holds that 1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4 is the union of two psalmody measures to form one psalm, and that this psalm gives the answer to the poet's complaint against a domineering unrighteousness. As Driver says, "Marti has undoubtedly succeeded in extracting three consistent and logical wholes; but the dislocation which has to be postulated for no. 3 is too improbable." (2) The "woes" would seem to need an adequate historical occasion and background to bring them into existence. Whatever the excesses of the Chaldeans against other nations in 540 B. C., the Jews in Babylon do not seem to have been unduly oppressed. As a matter of fact the exiles seem to have been more prosperous than their countrymen in the homeland. With this in mind it is not clear how an older prophetic segment, written in 605 B. C., so well fitted the conditions which obtained in 540 B.C. that an author living in the latter period could join together the older prophetic segment and a vitriolic diatribe against the oppressors of his own day, and find them a perfect match, in practically every particular. (3) Nor is his statement that the psalm (1:2-4, 12a, 13, 2:1-4) was allowed in the second century B. C. to be written on the margin, and then later inserted into the text, in broken pieces, very convincing.

1 - Century Bible, p. 58ff.

Another writer who has accepted the Fragmentary or Composite Theory is Firmin Nicolardot. He holds that the book is composed of several fragments of which the first redaction stretches itself over several centuries. These fragments, or pieces, are as follows: (1) The earliest prophecy (1:5-10, 14-17). This prophecy, which is the announcement of the coming of the Chaldeans, belongs to the seventh century B. C. (2) The prediction of the downfall of the Chaldeans (2:5-17), written about the middle of the sixth century (550 B. C.). (3) The Psalm (1:2-4, 13; 2:4) which was combined with fragments of the first prophecy between the fifth and third centuries B. C. (4) The Psalm, ch. 3, written probably in the fourth century B. C., at the time of the persecution of Arta-Xexes III. It became a part of the Psalter in the third century B. C., and a little later, in the same century, was made the conclusion of our book. The redaction of the whole book was completed about the second half of the third century.

As Stonehouse says[1], "This view, though ably argued, can scarcely be said to possess any advantage over the ones just considered, and it would be interesting to know the history of the preservation of 1:5-10, 14-17, and, indeed, of 2:5-19, before the work of redaction began."

The Reconstructive Theory.

The leading exponents of this view are Karl Budde, George Adam Smith and A. Van Hoonacker. It was first proposed by

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, p. 78.

Another writer who has accepted the Fragmentary or Composite Theory is Firmin Nicolardot. He holds that the book is composed of several fragments of which the first redaction stretches itself over several centuries. These fragments, or pieces, are as follows: (1) The earliest prophecy (1:5-10, 14-17). This prophecy, which is the announcement of the coming of the Chaldeans, belongs to the seventh century B. C. (2) The prediction of the downfall of the Chaldeans (2:5-17), written about the middle of the sixth century (550 B. C.). (3) The Psalm (1:2-4, 13; 2:4) which was combined with fragments of the first prophecy between the fifth and third centuries B. C. (4) The Psalm, ch. 3, written probably in the fourth century B. C., at the time of the persecution of Arta-Xerxes III. It became a part of the Psalter in the third century B. C., and a little later, in the same century, was made the conclusion of our book. The redaction of the whole book was completed about the second half of the third century.

As Stonehouse says, "This view, though ably argued, can scarcely be said to possess any advantage over the ones just considered, and it would be interesting to know the history of the preservation of 1:5-10, 14-17, and, indeed, of 2:5-19, before the work of redaction began."

The Reconstructive Theory.

The leading exponents of this view are Karl Budde, George Adam Smith and A. Van Hoonacker. It was first proposed by

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, p. 78.

Budde in 1893[1]. In 1895 he again expounded it in the Expositor[2].

Budde begins with Giesebrecht's view that 1:12 immediately connected with 1:4, and that 1:5-11 is, in the present arrangement of the text, out of its original place. He does not, however, agree with Giesebrecht in regarding 1:5-11 as a complete oracle, preceding v. 2. On the contrary, Budde is sure that 1:5-11 does not form a complete oracle for the following reasons: (1) In what is said of the invasion of the nations, there is no such reference to Judah as we would expect in the case of a Hebrew prophet. (2) The prophecy 1:2-4; 12-17; 2:1-8, regarded as a prophecy against the Chaldeans, has no intelligible conclusion. The announcement of the overthrow of the oppressing world-power is wholly absent. We simply have in 2:6f. a hymn or parable against a power of which we have, as yet, heard nothing.

Again, if a powerful nation is to be overthrown, a second nation is required to effect the overthrow. Habakkuk must, therefore, speak of two nations. As 1:5-11 announces to the Chaldeans their conquests of cities and kingdoms, they are manifestly, in Habakkuk's oracle, not the anvil, but the hammer. In that case the proper place for 1:5-11 is not, as a piece complete in itself, before 1:2, but after 2:4, as the needed conclusion. With the view of the overthrowing of the oppressor of the present, Yahweh will raise up the Chaldeans and make them victorious. In which case the oppressor of that time is none other than the Assyrians, and Habakkuk's prophecy is not directed against the Chaldeans,

1 - In Theologische Studien Und Kritiken pp 383-393, 1893.

2 - In Expositor, May 1895, pp. 372-385.

Budde in 1893[1]. In 1895 he again expounded it in the Expositor[2].

Budde begins with Giesebrecht's view that 1:12 immediately connected with 1:4, and that 1:5-11 is, in the present arrangement of the text, out of its original place. He does not, however, agree with Giesebrecht in regarding 1:5-11 as a complete oracle, preceding v. 2. On the contrary, Budde is sure that 1:5-11 does not form a complete oracle for the following reasons: (1) In what is said of the invasion of the nations, there is no such reference to Judah as we would expect in the case of a Hebrew prophet. (2) The prophecy 1:2-4; 12-17; 2:1-8, regarded as a prophecy against the Chaldeans, has no intelligible conclusion. The announcement of the overthrow of the oppressing world-power is wholly absent. We simply have in 2:8f. a hymn or parable against a power of which we have, as yet, heard nothing.

Again, if a powerful nation is to be overthrown, a second nation is required to effect the overthrow. Habakkuk must, therefore, speak of two nations. As 1:5-11 announces to the Chaldeans their conquests of cities and kingdoms, they are manifestly, in Habakkuk's oracle, not the anvil, but the hammer. In that case the proper place for 1:5-11 is not, as a piece complete in itself, before 1:2, but after 2:4, as the needed conclusion. With the view of the overthrowing of the oppressor of the present, Yahweh will raise up the Chaldeans and make them victorious. In which case the oppressor of that time is none other than the Assyrians, and Habakkuk's prophecy is not directed against the Chaldeans,

1 - In Theologische Studien Und Kritiken pp 383-393, 1893.

2 - In Expositor, May 1895, pp. 372-385.

but against the Assyrians.

Budde explains the displacement of the text (1:5-11 after 2:1-4) in the following way: The prophecy of Habakkuk remained unfulfilled. The invasion of the Chaldeans did not bring to Judah, life, freedom, and prosperity, but destruction and misery. This was due, doubtless, to the evil policy of Judah, which defied all the prophetic warnings of Jeremiah. But lack of fulfilment did not change the current view of the abstract validity of prophecy. Accordingly, by transposing the section 1:5-11, and perhaps, also, by the erasure of the name Assyria, it was made to appear that the prophecy announced the overthrow of the Chaldeans. Budde's arrangement of the book was as follows: 1:2-4, 12-17, 2: 1-4, 1:5-11, 2:5, 2:6-20; ch. 3.

Perhaps the most searching criticism of Budde's theory is that made by Davidson.[1] He takes up first Budde's transposition of 1:5-11 after 2:4. It will be remembered (see above) that Budde explained this by saying that, in the original prophecy, the Chaldeans had been announced as the destroyers of the Assyrians and the liberators of Israel. But the Chaldeans had failed so completely in their role of liberators of Israel that later editors changed the text so as to make it appear that the Chaldeans were to be the oppressors. This accounted for the removal of 1:5-11 from its true place after 2:4.

Of this explanation Davidson says that it is possible, but if it is true, criticism is not without its romance.

Second, he calls attention to the fact that nowhere in the

1 - Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges pp. 50-55.

but against the Assyrians.

Budde explains the displacement of the text (1:5-11 after 2:1-4) in the following way: The prophecy of Habakkuk remained unfulfilled. The invasion of the Chaldeans did not bring to Judah, life, freedom, and prosperity, but destruction and misery. This was due, doubtless, to the evil policy of Judah, which defied all the prophetic warnings of Jeremiah. But lack of fulfilment did not change the current view of the abstract validity of prophecy. Accordingly, by transposing the section 1:5-11, and perhaps, also, by the erasure of the name Assyria, it was made to appear that the prophecy announced the overthrow of the Chaldeans. Budde's arrangement of the book was as follows: 1:2-4, 12-17, 2: 1-4, 1:5-11, 2:5, 2:6-20; ch. 3.

Perhaps the most searching criticism of Budde's theory is that made by Davidson.[1] He takes up first Budde's transposition of 1:5-11 after 2:4. It will be remembered (see above) that Budde explained this by saying that, in the original prophecy, the Chaldeans had been announced as the destroyers of the Assyrians and the liberators of Israel. But the Chaldeans had failed so completely in their role of liberators of Israel that later editors changed the text so as to make it appear that the Chaldeans were to be the oppressors. This accounted for the removal of 1:5-11 from its true place after 2:4.

Of this explanation Davidson says that it is possible, but if it is true, criticism is not without its romance.

Second, he calls attention to the fact that nowhere in the

1 - Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges pp. 59-65.

two chapters does the name Assyria appear. Third, Budde would date the prophecy about 621-15 B. C. in the years immediately following Josiah's reformation. This was the only time the term "righteous" could be referred to Judah with good grace. TO this Davidson replies: It is not Israel alone, however, that is called "righteous" but other nations also (1:13); and even as applied to Israel the term "righteous" is a very uncertain criterion of date.

He makes several objections to the date 621-15 B. C. on the theory that the Assyrians are the oppressors complained of. While not much is known of this period of Assyrian history, it is very generally agreed that its hold on the Western provinces, after the death of Assurbanipal in 626, had become greatly relaxed. They would not be able to be the very powerful oppressors complained of in 12-17. The phrase "the Torah is paralyzed" does not comport well with Josiah's known zeal in the behalf of the observance of the Deuteronomic covenant at this time.

Again, it is hardly probable that the prophet would have possessed such an accurate knowledge of the Chaldeans as is suggested in 1:5-11, at such an early date as 621-15 B. C.

Fourth. While the "woes" pronounced in 2:5ff. might apply either to the Assyrians or Chaldeans, there is one point which is rather adverse to the supposition that different nations are referred to in 1:5-11 and 1:12-17. In 1:16 the nation spoken of deifies its might or its weapons. In 1:11 the Chaldeans are spoken of in practically the same way, "this his power becometh his god." This would imply that the nations were identical.

two chapters does the name Assyria appear. Third, Budde would
date the prophecy about 621-15 B. C. in the years immediately
following Josiah's reformation. This was the only time the term
"righteous" could be referred to Judah with good grace. To this
Davidson replies: It is not Israel alone, however, that is call-
led "righteous" but other nations also (1:13); and even as applied
to Israel the term "righteous" is a very uncertain criterion of
date.

He makes several objections to the date 621-15 B. C. on the
theory that the Assyrians are the oppressors complained of. While
not much is known of this period of Assyrian history, it is very
generally agreed that its hold on the Western provinces, after the
death of Assurbanipal in 626, had become greatly relaxed. They
would not be able to be the very powerful oppressors complained
of in 12-17. The phrase "the Torah is paralyzed" does not com-
port well with Josiah's known zeal in the behalf of the observance
of the Deuteronomic covenant at this time.

Again, it is hardly probable that the prophet would have
possessed such an accurate knowledge of the Chaldeans as is sug-
gested in 1:5-11, at such an early date as 621-15 B. C.

Fourth. While the "woes" pronounced in 2:6ff. might apply
either to the Assyrians or Chaldeans, there is one point which is
rather adverse to the supposition that different nations are refer-
red to in 1:5-11 and 1:12-17. In 1:16 the nation spoken of
defies its might or its weapons. In 1:11 the Chaldeans are
spoken of in practically the same way, "This his power becometh
his god." This would imply that the nations were identical.

George Adam Smith,[1] who follows in the main Budde's argument, says that while the objections raised by Davidson are not inconsiderable, they are not conclusive. He, however, while accepting Budde's view that the Chaldeans were raised up to liberate Judah from a foreign oppressor, takes the view that this oppressor was probably Egypt. He reminds us that Judah was sorely beset by Egypt from 608-605 B. C. It was probably during this period that Judah and the prophet had reason to complain of the heavy hand of a foreign oppressor. There is, however, some doubt in his mind as to whether the description in 1:14-17 suits Egypt as well as it does Assyria. He, therefore, concludes that the tyrant is either Assyria up to about 615, or Egypt from 608-605 B.C.

Another writer who may be named in this connection is A. Von Hoonacker.[2] He agrees with Giesebrecht, Wellhausen, and Nowack, that 1:5-11 is out of its proper place and thinks that vv. 12-17 are the continuation of 1:2-4. However, he does not believe that Habakkuk would have composed the complaint of 1:2-4 and 12-17 without naming the oppressor whom he had in view if the oppressor had not been on the scene. Further, he thinks 1:11b introduces the complaint of Habakkuk which is continued through 1:2-4 and 12-17, and to which Yahweh responds in 2:1ff. He regards the present text of 1:11b as incorrect and emends it to read אָשִׂים הכחי לֵאלֹהַי instead of אָשָׁם זו כחו לֵאלֹהוֹ . This he would render, "I will address my complaint to my God," (p. 456f).

1 - The Twelve Prophets, Vol. II, p. 122f.

2 - Les Douze Petites Prophetes pp. 456-497.

3 - However, the usual word for "my complaint" is שִׂיחִי (cf. Job 23, 2; 7, 13; 9,27; 10,1; ISam. 1,16).

George Adam Smith,[1] who follows in the main Budde's argument, says that while the objections raised by Davidson are not inconsiderable, they are not conclusive. He, however, while accepting Budde's view that the Chaldeans were raised up to liberate Judah from a foreign oppressor, takes the view that this oppressor was probably Egypt. He reminds us that Judah was sorely beset by Egypt from 608-605 B. C. It was probably during this period that Judah and the prophet had reason to complain of the heavy hand of a foreign oppressor. There is, however, some doubt in his mind as to whether the description in 1:14-17 suits Egypt as well as it does Assyria. He, therefore, concludes that the tyrant is either Assyria up to about 615, or Egypt from 608-605 B.C.

Another writer who may be named in this connection is A. Von Hoonacker.[2] He agrees with Giesebrecht, Wellhausen, and Nowack, that 1:5-11 is out of its proper place and thinks that vv. 12-17 are the continuation of 1:2-4. However, he does not believe that Habakkuk would have composed the complaint of 1:2-4 and 12-17 without naming the oppressor whom he had in view if the oppressor had not been on the scene. Further, he thinks 1:11b introduces the complaint of Habakkuk which is continued through 1:2-4 and 12-17, and to which Yahweh responds in 2:1ff. He regards the present text of 1:11b as incorrect and emends it to read יָחַף רוּחַ עָבַר instead of חָלַף וְאָז נָשַׁם . This he would render, "I will address my complaint to my God" (p. 456f).

1 - The Twelve Prophets, Vol. II, p. 122f.

2 - Les Douze Petites Prophetes pp. 456-457.

3 - However, the usual word for "my complaint" is שִׂיחִי (cf. Job 23, 2; 7, 13; 9,27; 10,1; 1Sam. 1,16).

Since it was the proclamation of the coming of the Chaldeans in 1:5-11 which was responsible for the complaint of the prophet which begins in 1:2-4 and continues through 1:12-17, the author concludes that originally this proclamation of Yahweh (1:5-11) formed the beginning of the book preceding 1:2-4 and 12-17. In all probability 1:5ff was introduced as a divine discourse, perhaps by the formula, "Thus speaks Yahweh". This formula disappeared on the occasion of the transposition. Its disappearance would be explained perhaps by the circumstance, that when transposed the formula would naturally be placed on the margin. The first page, or leaf, of the copy, on the margin of which the formula was written, then disappeared or was destroyed. He thinks the Chaldeans were the oppressors, and that the date of the prophecy was between 605 and 600 B. C. At this time the Chaldeans were virtually masters of Palestine. In three years they were destined to capture Jerusalem.

With reference to ch. 3, while he thinks that vv. 17-19 constitute an addition from a later hand, the poem found in 3: 2-16 is of common origin with chs. 1 and 2.

Something may be said in favor of the above view. It tends to emphasize the theory that the oppressor in 1:2-4 and 12-17 is the same, since it combines these two segments and makes 12-17 a continuation of 1:2-4. Further, it would seem that Hoonacker is correct in his view that the prophet would not have composed the complaint in 1:2-4 and 12-17 without naming the oppressor whom he had in mind, if the oppressor had not been on scene. But in most of his conclusions we cannot follow him. Take, for example, his proposal to regard 1:5-11 as the intro-

Since it was the proclamation of the coming of the Chal-
deans in 1:5-11 which was responsible for the complaint of the
prophet which begins in 1:2-4 and continues through 1:12-17, the
author concludes that originally this proclamation of Yahweh
(1:5-11) formed the beginning of the book preceding 1:2-4 and
12-17. In all probability 1:5ff was introduced as a divine
discourse, perhaps by the formula, "Thus speaks Yahweh". This
formula disappeared on the occasion of the transposition. Its
disappearance would be explained perhaps by the circumstance,
that when transposed the formula would naturally be placed on the
margin. The first page, or leaf, of the copy, on the margin of
which the formula was written, then disappeared or was destroyed.
He thinks the Chaldeans were the oppressors, and that the date of
the prophecy was between 608 and 600 B. C. At this time the
Chaldeans were virtually masters of Palestine. In three years
they were destined to capture Jerusalem.

With reference to ch. 3, while he thinks that vv. 17-19
constitute an addition from a later hand, the poem found in 3:
2-16 is of common origin with one. 1 and 2.

Something may be said in favor of the above view. It
tends to emphasize the theory that the oppressor in 1:2-4 and 12-
17 is the same, since it combines these two segments and makes
12-17 a continuation of 1:2-4. Further, it would seem that
Hoonacker is correct in his view that the prophet would not have
composed the complaint in 1:2-4 and 12-17 without naming the
oppressor whom he had in mind, if the oppressor had not been on
scene. But in most of his conclusions we cannot follow him.
Take, for example, his proposal to regard 1:5-11 as the intro-

duction to the prophet's complaint in 1:2-4 and 12-17. As Stonehouse aptly observes in this connection, it would be exceedingly unusual for a prophet to do such a thing as Hoonacker suggests. He holds that the prophet makes his complaint immediately following his statement of Jehovah's purpose to raise up the Chaldeans. "The prophet," says Stonehouse,[1] "in making announcement in Jehovah's name does not dissociate himself from the message he gives and expostulates with Jehovah for what he has predicted, but, on the contrary, speaks as his representative and seeks to interpret and justify the pronouncements in the light of the circumstances in which he lived."

Then, take the view that 1:11b introduces the prophet's complaint. In order to make it square with his own theory Hoonacker has to emend the text so as to make it read, "I will address my complaint to my God". The emendation of the text for that purpose is hardly such as to inspire confidence.

And, finally, notice his explanation of how his supposed formula, by which 1:5-11 was introduced, was lost. To suppose that it did exist, but was placed on the margin of the page when the proclamation was transposed after 1:2-4, and that this page was then lost or destroyed, seems to be giving rather free reins to the author's imagination. There are no data to warrant such a conclusion. Therefore, it is hardly probable that Hoonacker's solution will be accepted with any great amount of enthusiasm by scholars.

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, p. 90ff.

duction to the prophet's complaint in 1:2-4 and 12-17. As Stone-
house aptly observes in this connection, it would be exceedingly
unusual for a prophet to do such a thing as Hoonacker suggests. He
holds that the prophet makes his complaint immediately following
his statement of Jehovah's purpose to raise up the Chaldeans. "The
prophet," says Stonehouse,[1] "in making announcement in Jehovah's
name does not dissociate himself from the message he gives and ex-
postulates with Jehovah for what he has predicted, but, on the con-
trary, speaks as his representative and seeks to interpret and
justify the pronouncements in the light of the circumstances in
which he lived."

Then, take the view that I:11b introduces the prophet's com-
plaint. In order to make it square with his own theory Hoonacker
has to amend the text so as to make it read, "I will address my
complaint to my God". The emendation of the text for that purpose
is hardly such as to inspire confidence.

And, finally, notice his explanation of how his supposed
formula, by which I:5-11 was introduced, was lost. To suppose
that it did exist, but was placed on the margin of the page when
the proclamation was transposed after I:2-4, and that this page was
then lost or destroyed, seems to be giving rather free reins to the
author's imagination. There are no data to warrant such a conclu-
sion. Therefore, it is hardly probable that Hoonacker's solution
will be accepted with any great amount of enthusiasm by scholars.

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, p. 90ff.

The Redactional Theory.

A fourth theory is that known as the "Redactional Theory". It was advanced by J. W. Rothstein[1] in 1894, in opposition to the view which had been proposed by Budde in the same magazine in 1893.

Rothstein held that the present arrangement of chs. 1 and 2 was not the original arrangement. The prophecy had come to its present arrangement through a somewhat considerable redactional process. Originally there was an old prophetic complaint, a great deal more brief, against the exactions which the unjust rich imposed upon their fellow-countrymen in Israel. That was the theme of the original prophecy. This prophecy was first written about 605 B. C., as an oracle against Jehoiakim and the godless in Israel. It was "worked over" during the Exile by a later hand, and its whole purpose changed. Where, before, it was directed against the godless in Israel, it is now made to apply to the Chaldeans. According to Rothstein, the original prophecy was 1:2-4, 12a, 13; 2:1-5a; 1:6-10, 1:14 (reading יַעֲשֶׂה), 15a; 2: 6b, 7; 2:9-11 (except קְצוֹת עַר/); 2:15, 16 (partially); 2:19, 18.

Stonehouse's criticism[2] of Rothstein's theory strikes the writer as especially pertinent. He says, this view of the prophecy shows keen insight into the literary writings of the times, but his conception as to the redactional process, through

1 - In Theologische Studien Und Kritiken, pp. 51-85.

2 - The Book of Habakkuk, p. 92f.

The Redactional Theory.

A fourth theory is that known as the "Redactional Theory". It was advanced by J. W. Rothstein[1] in 1894, in opposition to the view which had been proposed by Budde in the same magazine in 1893.

Rothstein held that the present arrangement of chs. 1 and 2 was not the original arrangement. The prophecy had come to its present arrangement through a somewhat considerable redactional process. Originally there was an old prophetic complaint, a great deal more brief, against the exactions which the unjust rich imposed upon their fellow-countrymen in Israel. That was the theme of the original prophecy. This prophecy was first written about 605 B. C., as an oracle against Jeoiakim and the godless in Israel. It was "worked over" during the Exile by a later hand, and its whole purpose changed. Where, before, it was directed against the godless in Israel, it is now made to apply to the Chaldeans. According to Rothstein, the original prophecy was 1:2-4, 12a, 13; 2:1-5a; 1:5-10, 1:14 (reading נעבר), 15a; 2: 6b, 7; 2:9-11 (except ע"י מיצר); 2:15, 16 (partially); 3:19, 18.

Stonehouse's criticism[2] of Rothstein's theory strikes the writer as especially pertinent. He says, this view of the prophecy shows keen insight into the literary writings of the times, but his conception as to the redactional process, through

1 - In Theologische Studien Und Kritiken, pp. 81-86.

2 - The Book of Habakkuk, p. 22f.

which the prophecy passed, will doubtless be regarded as too elaborate. It is highly improbable that any editor would have re-edited an older oracle as minutely, and transformed it so thoroughly, as Rothstein's theory suggests. That would mean attributing to him all the acuteness and insight of the modern critic. On the contrary, the editor of Old Testament times never thought of doing anything so elaborate. He contented himself with making some slight changes in the text, with the view of making the "received text" more understandable.

Interpretative Theories.

And now we come to those views which, while they differ from each other, may all be classed under the general head of Interpretative Theories.

In this connection, an interesting view is that advanced by Prof. Betteridge[1]. He holds that in chs. 1:2-2:5 we have two parallel sections, both dealing with the destruction that shall come to the cruel oppressor. The oppressor is not the Chaldean, nor is there here, a reference to a class in Jewish society. Budde, he thinks, was correct in saying that Assyria was the oppressor referred to. He does not agree with Budde, however, in the view that 1:5-11 originally followed 2:4.

To the objection that Assyria is nowhere named in the prophecy itself, he says the objection is not valid, for the description of the tyrant is such as to show that his presence was so definitely and vividly felt by the whole people that

1 - In American Journal of Theology, Oct. 1903, pp. 647-662.

which the prophecy passed, will doubtless be regarded as too elaborate. It is highly improbable that any editor would have re-edited an older oracle as minutely, and transformed it so thoroughly, as Rothstein's theory suggests. That would mean attributing to him all the acuteness and insight of the modern critic. On the contrary, the editor of Old Testament times never thought of doing anything so elaborate. He contented himself with making some slight changes in the text, with the view of making the "received text" more understandable.

Interpretative Theories.

And now we come to those views which, while they differ from each other, may all be classed under the general head of Interpretative Theories.

In this connection, an interesting view is that advanced by Prof. Betteridge[1]. He holds that in chs. 1:2-2:5 we have two parallel sections, both dealing with the destruction that shall come to the cruel oppressor. The oppressor is not the Chaldean, nor is there here, a reference to a class in Jewish society. Budde, he thinks, was correct in saying that Assyria was the oppressor referred to. He does not agree with Budde, however, in the view that 1:5-11 originally followed 2:4.

To the objection that Assyria is nowhere named in the prophecy itself, he says the objection is not valid, for the description of the tyrant is such as to show that his presence was so definitely and vividly felt by the whole people that

1 - In American Journal of Theology, Oct. 1903, pp. 647-665.

there was no need of naming him.

As to the date of the prophecy, he thinks that there are two periods in which it might have arisen: (1) In connection with the rebellion against Assurbanipal, which was organized by his brother Shamash-Shumukin, who had been established by his father as regent of Babylon under the suzerainty of Assyria. This rebellion began about 652 B. C. and continued for some years before it was finally crushed. But there are decisive reasons against the view that this was the period, viz: (1) Under Manasseh's reign no prophet would have spoken of the Judean states as being relatively righteous; (2) The Chaldeans had only a subordinate part in this rebellion and could not be spoken of as saviours of the Jews.

The other and more probable period was the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 B. C. The Chaldeans were very prominent at the close of the eighth century. Merodach-Baladan had held the throne of Babylon from 720 - 709 B. C., when he was defeated by Sargon. However, he rebelled again when Sennacherib came to the throne. Although the rebellion was put down by Sennacherib, when the latter made what was probably a second expidition into Judah and besieged Jerusalem, he was forced to raise the siege because of another uprising of Merodach-Baladan. It was during this siege that the book of Habakkuk was written.

Betteridge is of the opinion that Habakkuk was, therefore, an associate of Isaiah in this great crisis of Judah's history. This view, he thinks, is the only satisfactory explanation of the remarkable similarity in thought and diction between the prophecy of Habakkuk and many of the utterances of Isaiah.

Finally, he sees no reason for not accepting the

there was no need of naming him.

As to the date of the prophecy, he thinks that there are two periods in which it might have arisen: (1) In connection with the rebellion against Assurbanipal, which was organized by his brother Shamash-Shumukin, who had been established by his father as regent of Babylon under the suzerainty of Assyria. This rebellion began about 652 B. C. and continued for some years before it was finally crushed. But there are decisive reasons against the view that this was the period; viz: (1) Under Manasseh's reign no prophet would have spoken of the Judean states as being relatively righteous; (2) The Chaldeans had only a subordinate part in this rebellion and could not be spoken of as saviours of the Jews.

The other and more probable period was the invasion of Sennacherib in 701 B. C. The Chaldeans were very prominent at the close of the eighth century. Merodach-Baladan had held the throne of Babylon from 720 - 709 B. C., when he was defeated by Sargon. However, he rebelled again when Sennacherib came to the throne. Although the rebellion was put down by Sennacherib, when the latter made what was probably a second expedition into Judah and besieged Jerusalem, he was forced to raise the siege because of another uprising of Merodach-Baladan. It was during this siege that the book of Habakkuk was written.

Betteridge is of the opinion that Habakkuk was, therefore, an associate of Isaiah in this great crisis of Judah's history. This view, he thinks, is the only satisfactory explanation of the remarkable similarity in thought and diction between the prophecy of Habakkuk and many of the utterances of Isaiah.

Finally, he sees no reason for not accepting the

traditional view as to the authorship of the Psalm in ch. 3. There is no incongruity in language or style as between the psalm and the rest of the prophecy. Further the circumstances furnished the occasion for such a psalm as this; therefore the author maintains that the Psalm is from the same hand and brain as the rest of the prophecy.

With reference to the theory that the oppressors were the Assyrians rather than the Chaldeans, we say again, as was said in objection to Budde's hypothesis, that it is rather striking, on that view of the case, that we have nowhere any mention of the Assyrians. Betteridge replies to this objection that the tyrant was so well known to the people that there was no need of naming him. But if this be true, would we not expect a similar procedure on the part of the prophets generally, where a particular foreign foe was being spoken of? Note, however, the prophecies of Isaiah against Assyria (chs. 7:20; 10:5-15, 14:24-27); and against Babylon (14:4-21). He refers by name to Assyria again and again. Is it then probable that a prophet who regarded Isaiah so highly as did Habakkuk, and who was especially dependent upon him for his style in his prophecy against this particular oppressor, would have refused to follow his admired exemplar in the matter of naming the foreign foe?

The date he suggests is of great interest to us. The one thing that may be said in its favor as over against the date suggested by Budde is, that it does name a period in which the Assyrians were strong and active, and might easily have been described as the tyrants. However, there is considerable to be urged against the acceptance of this date. It would seem that

traditional view as to the authorship of the Pasim in ch. 3. There is no incongruity in language or style as between the pasim and the rest of the prophecy. Further the circumstances furnished the occasion for such a pasim as this; therefore the author maintains that the Pasim is from the same hand and brain as the rest of the prophecy.

With reference to the theory that the oppressors were the Assyrians rather than the Chaldeans, we say again, as was said in objection to Budde's hypothesis, that it is rather striking, on that view of the case, that we have nowhere any mention of the Assyrians. Betteridge replies to this objection that the tyrant was so well known to the people that there was no need of naming him. But if this be true, would we not expect a similar procedure on the part of the prophets generally, where a particular foreign foe was being spoken of? Note, however, the prophecies of Isaiah against Assyria (chs. 7:20; 10:5-15, 14:24-27); and against Babylon (14:4-21). He refers by name to Assyria again and again. Is it then probable that a prophet who regarded Isaiah so highly as did Habakkuk, and who was especially dependent upon him for his style in his prophecy against this particular oppressor, would have refused to follow his admired exemplar in the matter of naming the foreign foe?

The date he suggests is of great interest to us. The one thing that may be said in its favor as over against the date suggested by Budde is, that it does name a period in which the Assyrians were strong and active, and might easily have been described as the tyrants. However, there is considerable to be urged against the acceptance of this date. It would seem that

Merodach-Baladan's coming to the throne of Babylon in 720 would have aroused more enthusiasm among the oppressed peoples in Palestine than his revolt years afterward when he had been long out of power. But it is a well-known fact that during this period, Judah was strongly bound by an alliance to Assyria, brought about by her king Ahaz. And while it is true Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, entered into a conspiracy, in 702 B. C. with Merodach-Baladan and other Tyrian and Palestinian states to rid themselves of Assyrian control[1], it is hardly true that the Judeans were oppressed and afflicted as suggested in 1:2-4 and 12-17. Further, there is nothing to warrant the view that the Chaldeans were as well known to the Judeans as the representation in 1:5-11 would suggest.

Finally, if, as Betteridge claims, Habakkuk was an associate of Isaiah, it is strange that while he too prophesies against the Assyrians he nowhere intimates that the Chaldeans were to be raised up to deliver Israel.

As to Betteridge's view that we can explain the many similarities between Isaiah and Habakkuk only on the basis of their being contemporaries, and doubtless collaborators, our verdict must be that this does not by any means follow. Isaiah and Micah are known to have been contemporaries, and yet they have very little in common so far as thought and style are concerned. On the contrary, there is far more in common between Hosea, whose ministry dated from about 743-733, and Jeremiah, whose ministry extended from about 626-586, than between Amos and Hosea who were

1 - Goodspeed's Hist. of Assyrians and Babylonians pp. 258-260.

Merodach-Baladan's coming to the throne of Babylon in 720 would have aroused more enthusiasm among the oppressed peoples in Palestine than his revolt years afterward when he had been long out of power. But it is a well-known fact that during this period, Judah was strongly bound by an alliance to Assyria, brought about by her king Ahaz. And while it is true Hezekiah, the son of Ahaz, entered into a conspiracy, in 702 B. C. with Merodach-Baladan and other Tyrian and Palestinian states to rid themselves of Assyrian control[1], it is hardly true that the Judeans were oppressed and afflicted as suggested in 1:3-4 and 12-17. Further, there is nothing to warrant the view that the Chaldeans were as well known to the Judeans as the representation in 1:5-11 would suggest.

Finally, if, as Betteridge claims, Habakkuk was an associate of Isaiah, it is strange that while he too prophesies against the Assyrians he nowhere intimates that the Chaldeans were to be raised up to deliver Israel.

As to Betteridge's view that we can explain the many similarities between Isaiah and Habakkuk only on the basis of their being contemporaries, and doubtless collaborators, our verdict must be that this does not by any means follow. Isaiah and Micah are known to have been contemporaries, and yet they have very little in common so far as thought and style are concerned. On the contrary, there is far more in common between Hosea, whose ministry dated from about 743-733, and Jeremiah, whose ministry extended from about 628-586, than between Amos and Hosea who were

1 - Goodspeed's Hist. of Assyrians and Babylonians pp. 288-290.

really contemporaries. This matter of spiritual kinship is not one of proximity either in environment or age, but rather a matter of mutual sympathies, and a similar outlook on life. It is this that makes it possible for the stirring messages of the old Hebrew prophets to find a responsive chord in the hearts of men of the most diverse races, in the farthest stretches of time. Is it not better to agree with Kittel[1] , that in Habakkuk's prophecy and in those of others like him, we are witnessing a rebirth of the spirit and faith of Isaiah? As the peril threatening the Israelitic nation became more and more serious, faithful souls, who had before them Isaiah's prophecies touching the inviolability of Jerusalem, began to study these prophecies with new zeal. It thus came about that prophets like Habakkuk sought to explain the message of their great prophet (Isaiah) in the light of the terrible calamities that came upon Israel in the "latter days".

One of the most unique hypotheses, concerning the composition of Habakkuk, is that by Peiser[2]. First, he contends that Nineveh is the place of the origin of the prophecy of Habakkuk. He bases this view on the following considerations: (1) There are a number of resemblances between certain passages in the book of Habakkuk and the Assyrian literature. This suggested to Peiser that the writer of the book of Habakkuk must have been familiar with the literature of Assyria, and must have studied it in its own language. (2) He finds the reading וְעָם יְגוֹדְדֶנּוּ of the M. T. at the end of 3:16, unacceptable. He prefers the

1 - Hist. of Hebrews, Eng. Trans. 1896, vol. II, 380.

2 - Der Prophet Habakkuk, p. 10f.

1 - Hist. of Hebrews, Eng. Trans. 1896, vol. II, 380.

2 - Der Prophet Habakkuk, p. 107.

LXX, εἰς λαὸν παροικίας μου, instead. This would give the Hebrew rendering, לְעַם מְגוּרַי, "For or to the people among whom I dwell". Peiser contends that the prophet sees danger coming to the people among whom he is sojourning as a stranger. These people cannot be the people of Jerusalem, but of another city which had been once attacked by the Chaldeans, and were now in danger of being conquered. This city must be Nineveh, which was attacked several times before its final capture by the Medes. (3) The name Habakkuk is an Assyrian pseudonym.

Peiser concludes, therefore, that the prophet is not in Judah. Nineveh is the city where he finds himself being attacked by the Chaldeans.

In 3:13 reference is made to "Yahweh's anointed". Peiser understands this to be the prophet's designation of himself. He is Yahweh's anointed. This implies his royal lineage, and gives us a further clue, in Peiser's opinion, to the prophet's identity. He is a Jewish prince who was taken to Nineveh as a hostage. He was the son, or the grandson, of Manasseh. As a member of the Jewish royal family, he aspired to the throne of his fathers, and was watching his opportunity to attain his ambition.

The date of the prophecy was about 609 B. C., near the time of Josiah's death, and perhaps occasioned by that tragic event. This date is confirmed by another indication. A prince of the "house of the wicked one" has been defeated by Yahweh (3:13). The wicked one, according to Peiser, was none other than Madyas, king of the Scythians, grandson, by his mother, of Esarhaddon. He had been killed by the Medes when he tried to lift their siege against Nineveh.

people cannot be the people of Jerusalem, but of another city which had been once attacked by the Chaldeans, and were now in danger of being conquered. This city must be Nineveh, which was attacked several times before its final capture by the Medes.

(3) The name Habakkuk is an Assyrian pseudonym.

Peiser concludes, therefore, that the prophet is not in Judah. Nineveh is the city where he finds himself being attacked by the Chaldeans.

In 3:13 reference is made to "Yahweh's anointed". Peiser understands this to be the prophet's designation of himself. He is Yahweh's anointed. This implies his royal lineage, and gives us a further clue, in Peiser's opinion, to the prophet's identity. He is a Jewish prince who was taken to Nineveh as a hostage. He was the son, or the grandson, of Manasseh. As a member of the Jewish royal family, he aspired to the throne of his fathers, and was watching his opportunity to attain his ambition.

The date of the prophecy was about 609 B. C., near the time of Josiah's death, and perhaps occasioned by that tragic event. This date is confirmed by another indication. A prince of the "house of the wicked one" has been defeated by Yahweh (3:13). The wicked one, according to Peiser, was none other than Madyas, king of the Scythians, grandson, by his mother, of Esarhaddon. He had been killed by the Medes when he tried to LIFT their siege against Nineveh.

As Nicolardot says, one must admire this ingenious reconstruction of the prophecy of Habakkuk by Peiser, but on close examination it becomes very evident that both his critical methods and his conclusions are arbitrary and unconvincing. Note that most of the evidence for the view that Habakkuk is a resident of Nineveh is based on ch. 3. When one remembers that there is, to say the least, grave doubt as to the authenticity of ch. 3, it may be seen how precarious a procedure it is to construct one's solution of practically all the problems of the book on a disputed rendering of a passage in ch. 3.

Again, Peiser presumes too much upon the parallels found between the cuneiform texts and the writings of Habakkuk. The employment of one or two analogous expressions in the context, and in a totally different sense, would hardly constitute a presumption that both passages were inspired from a common Assyrian source.

With reference to the view that the name of Habakkuk is Assyrian, it may be added that the hypothesis of Peiser does not justify it. All that one can be sure of in this connection is that the name was not anterior to the period of the captivity. The identity of Habakkuk with the author of the whole book remains an open question.

As to the expression "thine anointed", 3:13, there is nothing to prove that it does not designate the whole Jewish nation, as a parallel to the expression "thy people," found in the preceding line of the same verse. Still less has one the right to suppose that the poet means to designate himself, personally, by the use of this expression, and besides, to make

As Nicolardot says, one must admire this ingenious reconstruction of the prophecy of Habakkuk by Pelser, but on close examination it becomes very evident that both his critical methods and his conclusions are arbitrary and unconvincing. Note that most of the evidence for the view that Habakkuk is a resident of Nineveh is based on ch. 3. When one remembers that there is, to say the least, grave doubt as to the authenticity of ch. 3, it may be seen how precarious a procedure it is to construct one's solution of practically all the problems of the book on a disputed rendering of a passage in ch. 3.

Again, Pelser presumes too much upon the parallels found between the cuneiform texts and the writings of Habakkuk. The employment of one or two analogous expressions in the context, and in a totally different sense, would hardly constitute a presumption that both passages were inspired from a common Assyrian source.

With reference to the view that the name of Habakkuk is Assyrian, it may be added that the hypothesis of Pelser does not justify it. All that one can be sure of in this connection is that the name was not anterior to the period of the captivity. The identity of Habakkuk with the author of the whole book remains an open question.

As to the expression "thine anointed", 3:13, there is nothing to prove that it does not designate the whole Jewish nation, as a parallel to the expression "thy people," found in the preceding line of the same verse. Still less has one the right to suppose that the poet means to designate himself, personally, by the use of this expression, and besides, to make

it known that he is a descendant of a long line of Jewish kings. Peiser's assumption, that the poet was the son, or grandson, of Manasseh, is purely arbitrary and gratuitous.

And so with reference to this unique hypothesis of Peiser, we conclude that while it is interesting, scholarly, and original, it is too arbitrary to be regarded as proven or even as probable.

One of the most unusual views relative to the book of Habakkuk is that of Bernard Duhm.[1] Duhm holds that the book is composed of six poems. They are all closely connected and treat of the same subject. They are written in well-constructed, four-line pieces. The first has alternate three and two accents. The other five are genuine three accented measures. These poems fall into two groups. The first three poems form the exposition. They are 1:2-4, 1:5-11; 1:12-17. The second group (2:1-3; 2:4a, 5-12, 13b, 17, 15, 16; 3:2-16) give the reply to the questions and complainings raised by the first group.

From the close connection of the six poems Duhm gets the impression that the first four 1:2-2:3 were written according to a carefully thought out plan, and that the last two were added by the author himself and are in agreement with the order of thought of the first four.

However, he thinks there is no sentence in the book which warrants us in thinking of the Chaldean as the nation referred to. On the contrary, there are many objections to such a view:

(1) The nation is spoken of by the prophet as suddenly appearing on the scene of history, and causing great astonishment

1 - Das Buch Habakkuk.

One of the most unusual views relative to the book of Habakkuk is that of Bernard Duhm.[1] Duhm holds that the book is composed of six poems. They are all closely connected and treat of the same subject. They are written in well-constructed, four-line pieces. The first has alternate three and two accents. The other five are genuine three accented measures. These poems fall into two groups. The first three poems form the exposition. They are 1:2-4, 1:5-11; 1:12-17. The second group (2:1-3; 2:4a, 5-12, 13b, 17, 18, 19; 3:2-16) give the reply to the questions and complainings raised by the first group.

From the close connection of the six poems Duhm gets the impression that the first four 1:2-2:3 were written according to a carefully thought out plan, and that the last two were added by the author himself and are in agreement with the order of thought of the first four.

However, he thinks there is no sentence in the book which warrants us in thinking of the Chaldean as the nation referred to. On the contrary, there are many objections to such a view:

(1) The nation is spoken of by the prophet as suddenly appearing on the scene of history, and causing great astonishment

1 - Das Buch Habakkuk.

because of its sudden appearance. The Chaldeans, in the 7th century, were a long known, powerful and friendly people to the Jews (Jer. 13:21), and since their contact with Assyria no one could be surprised that they should now share with Media in the Assyrian succession.

(2) The nation is described as "bitter and dreadful." The Chaldeans were not so represented by Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel. Not till after the storming of Jerusalem, the carrying away of the people, the imprisoning of two Judean kings, could the author of Isa. 14:4ff and Psalm 137 judge so harshly concerning them. In 604 B. C. no one would have so spoken of them.

(3) The nation is represented as "swift". The Chaldeans were very slow.

(4) The author speaks of the predatory campaigns of the new nation as an unusual bit of wickedness. But a writer, who in his youth had known the Assyrian yoke, and in 608 B. C. had experienced the subjugation of the Jews by Egypt, could hardly have regarded the Chaldeans as so wicked when they had taken Palestine from Egypt.

(5) The nation in question marched on its robbing expeditions from West to East: The Chaldeans marched from East to West.

(6) The robbing expeditions of the foreign nations referred to must have fallen in a time when the Jews had been accustomed for a long time to an unhistorical twilight; when they had intercourse in business and trade, with the rest of the folks, but did not shine among the rest of the nations politically; when to them "Torah" and "righteouness" were familiar terms of the true religion, when they were able to write a theophany with the

because of its sudden appearance. The Chaldeans, in the 7th century, were a long known, powerful and friendly people to the Jews (Jer. 13:21), and since their contact with Assyria no one could be surprised that they should now share with Media in the Assyrian succession.

(2) The nation is described as "bitter and dreadful." The Chaldeans were not so represented by Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel. Not till after the storming of Jerusalem, the carrying away of the people, the imprisoning of two Judean Kings, could the author of Isa. 14:4ff and Psalm 137 judge so harshly concerning them. In 604 B. C. no one would have so spoken of them.

(3) The nation is represented as "swift". The Chaldeans were very slow.

(4) The author speaks of the predatory campaigns of the new nation as an unusual bit of wickedness. But a writer, who in his youth had known the Assyrian yoke, and in 608 B. C. had experienced the subjugation of the Jews by Egypt, could hardly have regarded the Chaldeans as so wicked when they had taken Palestine from Egypt.

(5) The nation in question marched on its robbing expeditions from West to East: The Chaldeans marched from East to West.

(6) The robbing expeditions of the foreign nations referred to must have fallen in a time when the Jews had been accustomed for a long time to an unhistorical twilight; when they had intercourse in business and trade, with the rest of the folks, but did not shine among the rest of the nations politically; when to them "Torah" and "righteousness" were familiar terms of the true religion, when they were able to write a theophany with the

learning of an archeologist; when also the uneducated understood without further explanation the eschatological terms "end" and "delay" (Ch. 2:3); and the apocalyptic allusion to the Gomer (ch. 1:9) was listened to; when God was called already "the Holy", and in poetic speech "Eloah"; when the prophetic writer must borrow from a Micah and a Jeremiah the entire turn of an expression and sentence (2:9, 10, 12). For all of this the year 604 B. C. was too early.

Duhm thinks the prophet can only mean Alexander the Great of Macedonia. This is clear from ch. 1:6 where כַּשְׂדִּים should be written כִּתִּים or כִּתִּיִּם (cf. 1 Mac. 1:1; 8:5). He thinks the false name became fixed in the text in the third century B.C., before the Jews perceived that the Greeks were a wicked and haughty nation or adversary like the Chaldeans.

The appearance of the Macedonians was somewhat sudden to the Palestinians because they had scarcely heard of the successes of Philip in far away Europe. Further, the Macedonians were the only ones to march from West to East in the conquering manner described by the prophet.

The date of the prophecy, according to Duhm, was then about the time of the world-conquering carrer of Alexander the Great (334-331 B. C.). The prophet Habakkuk himself was no great prophet, nor genius, but a pure visionary, and serious, interested witness of the attitude of the Judean in his first encounter with the Greek spirit. Habakkuk wrote his visions and comments on a tablet, and 150 years later they were found by the scribe who gave us the present arrangement of the book. This scribe, because of the very pleasant relations now existing between the Jews

learning of an archaeologist; when also the unadvocated understood without further explanation the eschatological terms "end" and "delay" (Ch. 2:3); and the apocalyptic allusion to the Comer (ch. 1:9) was listened to; when God was called already "the Holy", and in poetic speech "Eloah"; when the prophetic writer must borrow from a Micah and a Jeremiah the entire turn of an expression and sentence (2:3, 10, 12). For all of this the year 604 B. C. was too early.

Duhm thinks the prophet can only mean Alexander the Great of Macedonia. This is clear from ch. 1:6 where כתים should be written כתים or כתיים (cf. 1 Mac. 1:1; 8:5). He thinks the false name became fixed in the text in the third century B.C., before the Jews perceived that the Greeks were a wicked and haughty nation or adversary like the Chaldeans.

The appearance of the Macedonians was somewhat sudden to the Palestinians because they had scarcely heard of the successes of Philip in far away Europe. Further, the Macedonians were the only ones to march from West to East in the conquering manner described by the prophet.

The date of the prophecy, according to Duhm, was then about the time of the world-conquering career of Alexander the Great (334-331 B. C.). The prophet Habakkuk himself was no great prophet, nor genius, but a pure visionary, and serious, interested witness of the attitude of the Judean in his first encounter with the Greek spirit. Habakkuk wrote his visions and comments on a tablet, and 150 years later they were found by the scribe who gave us the present arrangement of the book. This scribe, because of the very pleasant relations now existing between the Jews

and Greeks, felt that there must be a mistake in the prophet's use of the term Kittim. He must refer to the Chaldeans instead. So he changed 1:6 to accord with this view (Das Buch Hab. pp. 1-7).

This view of Duhm has not to any large extent commended itself to serious scholarship. Stonehouse speaks of it as an "extravagant view". Nicolardot says that "the Macedonian hypothesis of Duhm is ingenious. It is wisely followed up. But it rests upon an unacceptable elimination of the word 'the Chaldeans' to the profit of a conjectural mention of the Greeks, upon an unusual restitution of 'Gomer', upon a disputable interpretation of קְרִיסָה , a term itself not very clear, and which belongs to a member of a corrupt phrase, and upon some factitious comparisons". With this criticism Moulton (Expository times, Feb. 1907), and Cheyne (Jewish Quarterly Review, Oct. 1907 pp. 3ff) agree.

We pass now to a more detailed criticism of Duhm's view.

(1) Take his view that we have here six distinct poems written in well-constructed four-line stanzas, the first poem having alternate three and two accents, the other five being genuinely three accented measures.

In order to prove this part of his theory he is forced to take unusual liberties with the text. For example in 2:4 he cuts out the most celebrated text in the whole book: "The righteous shall live by faith"; in ch. 3 at the end of v. 2 the reading, "In wrath remember mercy;" at the end of v. 4 of the same chapter וְשָׂם חֲבִיוֹן עֻזּוֹ; in v. 6,"these were His goings from of old". V. 7 תַּחַת אָוֶן רָאִיתִי; ; V. 8, "Was Yahweh displeased with the

and Greeks, felt that there must be a mistake in the prophet's use of the term Kittim. He must refer to the Chaldeans instead. So he changed 1:6 to accord with this view (Das Buch Hab. pp. 1-7).

This view of Duhm has met to any large extent commended itself to serious scholarship. Stonehouse speaks of it as an "extravagant view". Nicolardot says that "the Macedonian hypothesis of Duhm is ingenious. It is wisely followed up. But it rests upon an unacceptable elimination of the word 'the Chaldeans' to the profit of a conjectural mention of the Greeks, upon an unusual restitution of 'Gomer', upon a disputable interpretation of נפל , a term itself not very clear, and which belongs to a member of a corrupt phrase, and upon some factitious comparisons". With this criticism Moulton (Expository times, Feb. 1907), and Cheyne (Jewish Quarterly Review, Oct. 1907 pp. 37ff) agree.

We pass now to a more detailed criticism of Duhm's view.

(1) Take his view that we have here six distinct poems written in well-constructed four-line stanzas, the first poem having alternate three and two accents, the other five being genuinely three accented measures.

In order to prove this part of his theory he is forced to take unusual liberties with the text. For example in 2:4 he cuts out the most celebrated text in the whole book: "The righteous shall live by faith"; in ch. 3 at the end of v. 2 the reading, "In wrath remember mercy;" at the end of v. 4 of the same chapter ראך נאון כבודו ; in v. 8, "Have Nahum displeased with the

rivers?" V. 14, the whole of the second half of the verse.

These are only a few instances of his wholesale emasculation of the text. While there are in the book, as practically all scholars agree, instances of textual corruption, it requires considerable bravery, not to say audacity, to throw out passage after passage simply because they do not fit in with some preconceived notion of metre having its origin in the author's own mind.

(2) He thinks there is no sentence in the book which gives us the right to think of the Chaldeans as the nation referred to. On the contrary, he sets forth several objections to this view.

For example, he thinks that the coming of the Chaldeans in 604 B. C. could have occasioned no surprise to the Jews of that period. In answer to this it should be remembered that the matter of chief interest to the Jews and to their prophet, who was their spokesman on this occasion, was not the question as to who was in the ascendency at Nineveh or Babylon, but the nearness of either of these conquering powers to their own land. They had scarcely recovered from the shock of the defeat suffered by Josiah against Necho. They were just beginning to become accustomed to their new masters, the Egyptians, when Carchemish came. The defeat of the Egyptians, who had defeated so decisively the forces of the Hebrews, was without doubt a great surprise to the Egyptians themselves, and must have caused no little astonishment among other nations. These nations see in the new, young giant from the East first of all their deliverer. For this they are grateful. But they are also astonished that the military machine of the Assyrians was defeated, and that it was followed so quickly by the defeat of the great Egyptian army.

river?" V. 14, the whole of the second half of the verse.

These are only a few instances of his wholesale emascula-
tion of the text. While there are in the book, as practically
all scholars agree, instances of textual corruption, it requires
considerable bravery, not to say audacity, to throw out passage
after passage simply because they do not fit in with some preco-
ceived notion of metre having its origin in the author's own mind.

(2) He thinks there is no sentence in the book which gives
us the right to think of the Chaldeans as the nation referred to.
On the contrary, he sets forth several objections to this view.
For example, he thinks that the coming of the Chaldeans in
604 B. C. could have occasioned no surprise to the Jews of that
period. In answer to this it should be remembered that the mat-
ter of chief interest to the Jews and to their prophet, who was
their spokesman on this occasion, was not the question as to who
was in the ascendency at Nineveh or Babylon, but the nearness of
either of these conquering powers to their own land. They had
scarcely recovered from the shock of the defeat suffered by Josiah
against Necho. They were just beginning to become accustomed to
their new masters, the Egyptians, when Carchemish came. The
defeat of the Egyptians, who had defeated so decisively the forces
of the Hebrews, was without doubt a great surprise to the Egyp-
tians themselves, and must have caused no little astonishment among
other nations. These nations see in the new, young giant from the
East first of all their deliverer. For this they are grateful.
But they are also astonished that the military machine of the
Assyrians was defeated, and that it was followed so quickly by the
defeat of the great Egyptian army.

(3) He thinks the representation of that nation as "bitter and hasty" could not apply to the Chaldeans who were not so represented by Jeremiah and others. This representation would certainly fit the Chaldeans, if the author had before him the very recent treatment of king Zedekiah and his sons, if there was before him the mental picture of the king blinded, and carried off to Babylon in chains, his sons executed before him, and the temple of God plundered by the robbing troops of the enemy. With such a picture before him, the surprise would be if he had not applied the severest epithets to the Chaldeans. The language used by the prophet in describing their plunderings comports well with the historical facts that have come down to us in connection with the siege and capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar.

(4) Duhm's statement that the nation marched from "West to East" is based as Nicolardot aptly shows, on the expression found in ch. 1:9 קְדִימָה פְּנֵיהֶם קְדִימָה . He thinks קְדִימָה can only mean "toward the East". But as Nicolardot says, this is only one of several possible readings. Besides, this word is part of a corrupt text, as most scholars agree. In the case of קְדִימָה Duhm has taken more liberties with the text, and has changed it to מִגֹּמֶר and reads it "from Gomer." To say that he is unwarranted in making this change, is putting it mildly.

(5) Duhm makes the statement that these robbing expeditions on the part of the foreign nation must have fallen at a time when the Jews had been for a long time "accustomed to an unhistorical twilight". They did not rank among the nations, but busied themselves with trade and the observance of the Torah.

How then can we explain the violent outbreak of the prophet

(3) He thinks the representation of that nation as "bitter and hasty" could not apply to the Chaldeans who were not so represented by Jeremiah and others. This representation would certainly fit the Chaldeans, if the author had before him the very recent treatment of king Zedekiah and his sons, if there was before him the mental picture of the king blinded, and carried off to Babylon in chains, his sons executed before him, and the temple of God plundered by the robbing troops of the enemy. With such a picture before him, the surprise would be if he had not applied the severest epithets to the Chaldeans. The language used by the prophet in describing their plunderings comports well with the historical facts that have come down to us in connection with the siege and capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadrezzar.

(4) Duhm's statement that the nation marched from "West to East" is based as Nicolardot aptly shows, on the expression found in ch. 1:9 מזרח מזרח מזרח . He thinks מזרח can only mean "toward the East". But as Nicolardot says, this is only one of several possible readings. Besides, this word is part of a corrupt text, as most scholars agree. In the case of מזרח Duhm has taken more liberties with the text, and has changed it to מזרח and reads it "from Gomer." To say that he is unwarranted in making this change, is putting it mildly.

(5) Duhm makes the statement that these robbing expeditions on the part of the foreign nation must have fallen at a time when the Jews had been for a long time "accustomed to an unhistorical twilight". They did not rank among the nations, but busied themselves with trade and the observance of the Torah.

Now then can we explain the violent outbreak of the prophet

in protest against this invasion? It would seem first that the habit of submission would have been so strongly instilled by this time that nothing of the kind would occasion surprise.

(6) Note how he rids the text of "Chaldean". Instead of כַּשְׂדִּים he insists that the text originally read כִּתִּים or כִּתִּיִּים . The difficulty with accepting this view is that all the versions have "Chaldean", and the reasons given for dropping it are, to say the least, far from convincing.

(7) He fixes the date at 334-331 B. C. No one can study the prophecy without coming to the conclusion that the writer was a profound student of the writings of Isaiah. And when we think of the emphasis of the older prophet on the inviolability of the temple at Jerusalem, it would seem to necessitate some such crisis as its destruction to wring from a student of his writings such denunciations as we have in this prophecy.

(8) He says that the sudden appearance of the Macedonians was something wholly unexpected by the Palestinians and incredible to them.

This hardly squares with Josephus' account of Alexander's coming into Palestine[1]. Here it seems that the movements of Alexander were perfectly well-known to the Jewish leaders. After defeating Darius at Issus, Alexander came into Syria and took Damascus. He then obtained Sidon, and besieged Tyre. At this time he sent an epistle to the Jewish high-priest, "To send him some auxiliaries and to supply his army with provisions; and

1 - The Works of Josephus, Trans. by Wm. Whiston, vol. II pp. 251-257.

in protest against this invasion? It would seem first that the habit of submission would have been so strongly instilled by this time that nothing of the kind would occasion surprise.

(6) Note now he rids the text of "Chaldean". Instead of [illegible] he insists that the text originally read [illegible] or [illegible]. The difficulty with accepting this view is that all the versions have "Chaldean", and the reasons given for dropping it are, to say the least, far from convincing.

(7) He fixes the date at 334-331 B. C. No one can study the prophecy without coming to the conclusion that the writer was a profound student of the writings of Isaiah. And when we think of the emphasis of the older prophet on the inviolability of the temple at Jerusalem, it would seem to necessitate some such crisis as the destruction to bring from a student of his writings such denunciations as we have in this prophecy.

(8) He says that the sudden appearance of the Macedonians was something wholly unexpected by the Palestinians and incredible to them.

This hardly squares with Josephus' account of Alexander's coming into Palestine[1]. Here it seems that the movements of Alexander were perfectly well-known to the Jewish leaders. After defeating Darius at Issus, Alexander came into Syria and took Damascus. He then obtained Sidon, and besieged Tyre. At this time he sent an epistle to the Jewish high-priest, "To send him some auxiliaries and to supply his army with provisions; and

1 - The Works of Josephus, Trans. by Wm. Whiston, vol. II pp. 231-237.

that what presents he formerly sent to Darius, he would now send to him and choose the friendship of the Macedonians, and that he should never repent of so doing." But the high-priest replied that he had given his oath of allegiance to Darius and could not desert him while he lived. Alexander, of course, was angry and determined to wreak vengeance on the recalcitrants. The high-priest too was greatly disturbed as to what reception should be given Alexander when he came. However, he was warned in a dream how to meet the conqueror, and Josephus tells how he did it in the following words:

"And when he understood he was not far from the city, he went out in procession with the priests and the multitude of the citizens. The procession was venerable, and the manner of it different from other nations. It reached to a place called Sapha, which name translated into Greek, signifies a prospect both of Jerusalem and of the temple; And when the Phoenicians and the Chaldeans that followed him thought that they should have liberty to plunder the city and torment the high-priest to death, which the king's displeasure fairly promised them, the very reverse of it happened; for Alexander, when he saw the multitude at a distance, in white garments, while the priests stood clothed with fine linen, and the high-priest in purple and scarlet clothing, with his mitre on his head, having the golden plate whereon the name of God was engraved, he approached by himself and adored that name, and first saluted the high-priest. The Jews did also altogether with one voice salute Alexander and encompass him about; whereupon the kings of Syria and the rest were surprised at what Alexander had done and supposed him disordered in mind."

that what presents he formerly sent to Darius, he would now send to him and choose the friendship of the Macedonians, and that he should never repent of so doing." But the high-priest replied that he had given his oath of allegiance to Darius and could not desert him while he lived. Alexander, of course, was angry and determined to wreak vengeance on the recalcitrants. The high-priest too was greatly disturbed as to what reception should be given Alexander when he came. However, he was warned in a dream how to meet the conqueror, and Josephus tells how he did it in the following words:

"And when he understood he was not far from the city, he went out in procession with the priests and the multitude of the citizens. The procession was venerable, and the manner of it different from other nations. It reached to a place called Sapha, which name translated into Greek, signifies a prospect both of Jerusalem and of the temple; And when the Phoenicians and the Chaldeans that followed him thought that they should have liberty to plunder the city and torment the high-priest to death, which the king's displeasure fairly promised them, the very reverse of it happened; for Alexander, when he saw the multitude at a distance, in white garments, while the priests stood clothed with fine linen, and the high-priest in purple and scarlet clothing, with his mitre on his head, having the golden plate whereon the name of God was engraved, he approached by himself and adored that name, and first saluted the high-priest. The Jews did also altogether with one voice salute Alexander and encompass him about; whereupon the kings of Syria and the rest were surprised at what Alexander had done and supposed him disordered in mind."

Then Josephus tells how he gave his right hand to the high-priest and went into the city, and going into the temple offered sacrifices to God according to the high-priest's directions.

Even after making all due allowance for whatever coloring Josephus, himself a Jew, may have given to this description of Alexander's entrance into Jerusalem, the views entertained of this entrance by Duhm and Josephus are still poles apart. And the critical student must lean to the view that there is hardly enough in the facts connected with Alexander's entrance, after all the coloring has been allowed for, to warrant such a denunciation of the Macedonians as is set forth in our prophecy. In view of all these facts we must agree with other critical scholars that Duhm is altogether mistaken in his conclusions as to the book and date of the prophet Habakkuk.

The most recent interpretation of the Book of Habakkuk that has come to the attention of the writer is that of Professor George G. V. Stonehouse[1], Vice Principal of the Theological College, Coates Hall, Edinburgh. He thinks that the real crux of the passage 1:1-2:1 is to be found in 1:5, 6a. These verses neither agree with the character of the description which is implied in by far the larger proportion of the prophetic message, nor does the form in which they are cast suggest that they were originally intended as an answer to the complaint raised in 1:2-4. For these reasons he thinks they must be discarded. In answer to his own question as to what relation 1:6b-11 sustains

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, 1911.

Then Josephus tells how he gave his right hand to the high-priest and went into the city, and going into the temple offered sacrifices to God according to the high-priest's directions.

Even after making all due allowance for whatever coloring Josephus, himself a Jew, may have given to this description of Alexander's entrance into Jerusalem, the views entertained of this entrance by Dunn and Josephus are still poles apart. And the critical student must lean to the view that there is hardly enough in the facts connected with Alexander's entrance, after all the coloring has been allowed for, to warrant such a denunciation of the Macedonians as is set forth in our prophecy. In view of all these facts we must agree with other critical scholars that Dunn is altogether mistaken in his conclusions as to the book and date of the prophet Habakkuk.

The most recent interpretation of the Book of Habakkuk that has come to the attention of the writer is that of Professor George G. V. Stonehouse[1] Vice Principal of the Theological College, Coates Hall, Edinburgh. He thinks that the real crux of the passage 1:1-2:1 is to be found in 1:5, 6a. These verses neither agree with the character of the description which is implied in by far the larger proportion of the prophetic message, nor does the form in which they are cast suggest that they were originally intended as an answer to the complaint raised in 1:2-4. For these reasons he thinks they must be discarded. In answer to his own question as to what relation 1:5b-11 sustains

1 - The Book of Habakkuk, 1911.

to 1:12-17, he says there is nothing in the description which the former verses give of the advancing Chaldeans which is inconsistent with the latter verses. On the contrary, the present text of 1:12ff presupposes some previous reference to an invading foe. And so the problem is as to the connection between 1:2-4 and 1:6b-17.

He does not agree either with those who hold that the wrongs complained of in 1:2-4 are domestic wrongs or that they were perpetrated by some external foe. He is not unmindful of the force of the arguments on both sides but thinks they are inconclusive. To him the true interpretation of vv. 2-4 is as follows:

The violence and wrongs of which the prophet speaks in vv. 1:2-4 are those which he sees perpetrated on neighboring peoples and not such as are immediately directed against his own countrymen. The terms used would be quite as applicable to a description of outrages which were being committed on the nations as to a description of what was being perpetrated in Judah. He accounts for the prophet's interest in these nations by the statements in v. 4 relative to the paralyzed state of the Torah and the fact that justice (mishpat) went forth perverted. He explains Torah as meaning "political direction" or "policy" of the nations. Mishpat was the "right course of action". The Torah's being slacked, then, would mean that the policy of intrigue and reliance on foreign aid was being substituted for the only correct rule of life for the Jews--absolute reliance on Yahweh. The verse is meant to set forth the gloomy prospect held out to the righteous in their endeavor to carry through the course of action to which they were pledged by the authoritative teaching of the prophets.

While Stonehouse thinks there is no good reason for doubting

to 1:12-17, he says there is nothing in the description which the former verses give of the advancing Chaldeans which is inconsistent with the latter verses. On the contrary, the present text of 1:12ff presupposes some previous reference to an invading foe. And so the problem is as to the connection between 1:2-4 and 1:5b-17.

He does not agree either with those who hold that the wrongs complained of in 1:2-4 are domestic wrongs or that they were perpetrated by some external foe. He is not unmindful of the force of the arguments on both sides but thinks they are inconclusive. To him the true interpretation of vv. 2-4 is as follows:

The violence and wrongs of which the prophet speaks in vv. 1:2-4 are those which he sees perpetrated on neighboring peoples and not such as are immediately directed against his own country-men. The terms used would be quite as applicable to a description of outrages which were being committed on the nations as to a description of what was being perpetrated in Judah. He accounts for the prophet's interest in these nations by the statements in v. 4 relative to the paralyzed state of the Torah and the fact that justice (mishpat) went forth perverted. He explains Torah as meaning "political direction" or "policy" of the nations. Mishpat was the "right course of action". The Torah's being slacked, then, would mean that the policy of intrigue and reliance on foreign aid was being substituted for the only correct rule of life for the Jews--absolute reliance on Yahweh. The verse is meant to set forth the gloomy prospect held out to the righteous in their endeavor to carry through the course of action to which they were pledged by the authoritative teaching of the prophets.

While Stonehouse thinks there is no good reason for doubting

the present position of 1:2-4 and their connection with 1:6bff. he is rather of the opinion that vv. 5, 6a formed the basis of the original text, but have been worked over in order to bring the text into conformity with the purpose the editor had in view. He thinks the original text was in the form of an address to Jehovah, in which not only 1:2-4 but vv. 6bff are to be understood as being a part of the prophet's plea. With this in mind Stonehouse would eliminate both the plural imperative and the clause הַגֹּיִם מֵעִים . According to this view, the prophet is directing attention to the astonishment the Chaldean army is causing among the nations. For this reason he prefers the M. T. בַּגּוֹיִם to the LXX, which in the Hebrew is בּוֹגְדִים . The original text probably read as follows:

רְאוּ הַגּוֹיִם

וְהַבִּיטוּ הִתְמַהְמְהוּ וְתִמָּהוּ כִּי־פֹעֵל פֹּעֵל בִּימֵיהֶם

לֹא יַאֲמִינוּ כִּי יְסֻפָּר כִּי הִנֵּה הַכַּשְׂדִּים

This he holds would not involve much change in the consonantal text; only the substitution of הַגּוֹיִם for בַּגּוֹיִם and the change of the second into the third person.

In Stonehouse's opinion our present arrangement came from the fact that an editor, about the time of the exile or later, desiring to make clear that the Chaldean had been raised up for judgment on the nation, and understanding 1:2-4 to refer to violence and wickedness within Judah, altered the text in v. 5 and v. 6a so as to make the prophet announce as a future event the appearance of the Chaldean rather than to refer to that power as a present evil in the land.

He thinks the date of the prophecy was in the year 604 or the beginning of 603 B. C. The occasion was the approach of

Nebuchadrezzar to invest Jerusalem.

He regards it as improbable that Habakkuk was the author of ch. 3, holding that this Psalm was probably taken from a Jewish Song-book. He regards the Psalm as probably composite, and thinks its original parts were composed in the times of the monarchy--perhaps the later monarchy. It is not so easy to say when the Psalm received its present form. "The remembrance of the past in order to give encouragement for the present suggests an exilic or post-exilic date."

With reference to this interpretation by Stonehouse there are a number of things that commend it to sane, critical scholarship. It is not a wild fanciful flight into imaginary realms in search of something novel, irrespective of its relation to the text in hand. And most certainly the principle that he has set forth as a guide for himself in his work is one that will commend itself to every earnest, reverent student of the scriptures. This is his principle, one that represents his attitude toward emendations and rearrangements of the text generally: "What is required is some explanation which will embrace these different elements of truth without at the same time either postulating any considerable rearrangement of the text or disturbing the literary unity of the chapters. It is only when this is done that we can hope for a satisfactory solution of the problem (The Bk. of Hab. p. 108).

However, there are several things about the view of Stonehouse which appear to be forced and unnatural. For example, he speaks of the violence and wrongs of which the prophet complained as the wrongs being perpetrated on the neighboring nations. Indeed, the inference is that they are righteous as against the

Nebuchadnezzar to invest Jerusalem.

He regards it as improbable that Habakkuk was the author of ch. 3, holding that this Psalm was probably taken from a Jewish Song-book. He regards the Psalm as probably composite, and thinks its original parts were composed in the times of the monarchy--perhaps the later monarchy. It is not so easy to say when the Psalm received its present form. "The remembrance of the past in order to give encouragement for the present suggests an exilic or post-exilic date."

With reference to this interpretation by Stonehouse there are a number of things that commend it to sane, critical scholarship. It is not a wild fanciful flight into imaginary realms in search of something novel, irrespective of its relation to the text in hand. And most certainly the principle that he has set forth as a guide for himself in his work is one that will commend itself to every earnest, reverent student of the scriptures. This is his principle, one that represents his attitude toward emendations and rearrangements of the text generally: "What is required is some explanation which will embrace these different elements of truth without at the same time either postulating any considerable rearrangement of the text or disturbing the literary unity of the chapters. It is only when this is done that we can hope for a satisfactory solution of the problem (The Bk. of Hab. p. 108).

However, there are several things about the view of Stonehouse which appear to be forced and unnatural. For example, he speaks of the violence and wrongs of which the prophet complained as the wrongs being perpetrated on the neighboring nations. Indeed, the inference is that they are righteous as against the

Chaldeans who are wicked. He explains the prophet's interest in them by saying that the prophet was concerned because it meant his own country would forsake her old policy of absolute reliance on Jehovah and resort to an alliance with foreign powers.

While we have the case of Jeremiah who spoke of himself as a "prophet to the nations", it is evident that he regarded this as giving him a larger scope for his work rather than as practically disassociating or separating him from the work of his own people. It would be an entirely new role for a Jewish prophet to have as the burden of his prophecy, the sufferings of other nations rather than his own.

Again the interpretation is forced and artificial which fails to relate the terms Torah and mishpat to the Jewish life of which they are inseparably a part.

As to his rearrangement of the text of 1:5, 6a, the reasons given are not convincing.

As to the date of chapters 1 and 2 and the connection of chapter 3 with the first two, we shall have more to say, later, in another chapter.

The views of three other important writers remain to be treated in this connection. They are Happel[1], Lauterburg[2], and Davidson[3].

According to Happel the prophecy of Habakkuk does not refer to the Chaldeans, although their name is used. The Chal-

1 - Das Buch des Propheten Habakkuk.
2 - In Meili's Theologische Zeitschrift Aus der Schweiz, pp.74-102.
3 - Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges pp. 45-94.

Chaldeans who are wicked. He explains the prophet's interest in them by saying that the prophet was concerned because it meant his own country would forsake her old policy of absolute reliance on Jehovah and resort to an alliance with foreign powers.

While we have the case of Jeremiah who spoke of himself as a "prophet to the nations", it is evident that he regarded this as giving him a larger scope for his work rather than as practically disassociating or separating him from the work of his own people. It would be an entirely new role for a Jewish prophet to have as the burden of his prophecy, the sufferings of other nations rather than his own.

Again the interpretation is forced and artificial which fails to relate the terms Torah and mishpat to the Jewish life of which they are inseparably a part.

As to his rearrangement of the text of 1:5, 6a, the reasons given are not convincing.

As to the date of chapters 1 and 2 and the connection of chapter 3 with the first two, we shall have more to say, later, in another chapter.

The views of three other important writers remain to be treated in this connection. They are Happel[1], Lauterburg[2], and Davidson[3].

According to Happel the prophecy of Habakkuk does not refer to the Chaldeans, although their name is used. The Chal-

1 - Das Buch des Propheten Habakkuk.
2 - In Meili's Theologische Zeitschrift Aus der Schweiz, pp.74-102
3 - Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges pp. 45-84.

deans are only typical of the enemy who is to rise up at the Messianic Age. The prophecy is not meant to be historical, but eschatological. One of his main arguments in support of this view is that, while those who are oppressed by the world conqueror are called the "righteous" (that is the people who are of the same race as the prophet), they were called in 1:4 "men", and in 1:17 the "peoples". But in 2:6 a distinction is made in the two types of "peoples". Thus the term "peoples" is made to include persons on both sides. He would explain this representation by saying that it is an eschatological picture which represents a powerful enemy rising up at the time of the Messianic Age, and including all the nations to join in war against the once powerful enemy.

Happel thinks the historical background of the prophecy is to be found in the post-exilic period, and for the following reasons: (1) The fact that Israel was called the "righteous" suggets a date when Israel was free from idol worship; and this must have been some time after the death of Josiah. (2) The fact that 2:13 is a quotation from Jeremiah 51:58; and (3) he construes, like Duhm, 1:9 to mean that the enemy came from the West. This he takes to indicate the Greek period; and the part of that period that he regards the most probable for the circumstances of our prophecy, is the beginning of the Syrian oppression under Antiochus IV, about 170 B. C.

In criticism of Happel's view, Von Hoonacker does not see why a contemporaneous prophet of the Chaldean conquest was not able to embrace in one common condemnation the feeling against the Chaldeans, in proclaiming the future triumph of the religion of Yahweh, a conception familiar enough to the prophets of

deans are only typical of the enemy who is to rise up at the Messianic Age. The prophecy is not meant to be historical, but eschatological. One of his main arguments in support of this view is that, while those who are oppressed by the world conqueror are called the "righteous" (that is the people who are of the same race as the prophet), they were called in I:4 "men", and in I:17 the "peoples". But in 2:8 a distinction is made in the two types of "peoples". Thus the term "peoples" is made to include persons on both sides. He would explain this representation by saying that it is an eschatological picture which represents a powerful enemy rising up at the time of the Messianic Age, and including all the nations to join in war against the once powerful enemy.

Happel thinks the historical background of the prophecy is to be found in the post-exilic period, and for the following reasons: (1) The fact that Israel was called the "righteous" suggests a date when Israel was free from idol worship; and this must have been some time after the death of Josiah. (2) The fact that 2:13 is a quotation from Jeremiah 51:58; and (3) he construes, like Duhm, 1:9 to mean that the enemy came from the West. This he takes to indicate the Greek period; and the part of that period that he regards the most probable for the circumstances of our prophecy, is the beginning of the Syrian oppression under Antiochus IV, about 170 B. C.

In criticism of Happel's view, Von Hoonacker does not see why a contemporaneous prophet of the Chaldean conquest was not able to embrace in one common condemnation the feeling against the Chaldeans, in proclaiming the future triumph of the religion of Yahweh, a conception familiar enough to the prophets of

the 7th century B. C. He thinks further that Happel's view that 1:9 should be modified so as to represent the enemy as coming from the West, is a conjecture without any foundation.

Marti thinks Happel's view does not do justice to the facts offered by the text. These facts, he thinks, lead to a wholly different view as to the origin of the book.

Stonehouse thinks Happel's view of the book will scarcely commend itself, because there is nothing in the book which would definitely suggest an eschatological interpretation.

Thus it is clear that scholars who have written on the subject since the appearance of Happel's book in 1900 do not accept his view of the solution of the problem.

One of the most interesting theories touching the Book of Habakkuk is that of Lauterburg[1]. Lauterburg regards the book as a unitary composition, written by a single author, during the later period of the exile. He proposes a radical change with reference to the announcement of the coming of the Chaldeans in 1:5-11. He would not read the names of these invaders as Chaldeans in 1:6. These invaders are the persons who have come for the purpose of liberating the Jews. The Chaldeans are the oppressors whom the Persians have come to chastise.

In support of his contention that the people mentioned in 1:6 are not Chaldeans, Lauterburg appeals to the LXX, one variant of which, while it mentions the name Chaldeans, is rather ambiguous as to its meaning. For example, the one he cites is as follows: ἰδοὺ ἐξεγείρω ἐφ' ὑμᾶς τοὺς Χαλδαίους τοὺς μαχητὰς τὸ

1 - Nicolardot's La Composition Du Livre D' Habacuc, p. 45 ff.

I - Nicolardot's La Composition Du Livre D'Habacuc, p. 45 ff.

ἔθνος τὸ πικρὸν καὶ τὸ ταχινόν

"Behold I raise up against you the Chaldeans, the warlike ones, the nation bitter and hasty". Lauterburg asks if the text as we have it here would not warrant us in making "Chaldeans" to stand in apposition to "you" rather than to have the three substantives as mutually independent of each other. On this view the Chaldeans would not be regarded as the avengers announced, but as the oppressors. He thinks the word "warlike" dropped out of the ext; and so the original reading was probably as follows;

שָׂרִים . כִּי הִנְנִי מֵקִים אֲלֵיכֶם שָׂרִים

may have been translated μαχητάς by reason of its affinity with שָׂרָה to strive, to contend, and בַּשְּׂרִים would be found in the original only because of the confusion of ר and ד , and of ם and כ .

As a proof that the Persians are meant here, he calls attention to the fact that their cavalry was described as being swift.

This is shown further in 1:7 in the expression "It is from himself that his judgment and dignity proceed." He takes this to refer to Cyrus who designated himself the king of Persia only after the Lydian conquests. In this Cyrus was like the first Prussian king who said "Ex me mea nota Corona."

Lauterburg makes another ingenious modification of the text. He changes v. 11 so as to make it read as follows:

אָז חָלַף רוּחַ וַיִּבְעַר אֵשׁ מְזַבְּחוֹ לֵאלֹהָיו

"Then he changes his disposition,- that is to say, his warlike thoughts give place to pious ones",- or: "Then his heart is lifted up--and he kindles the fire, sacrificing to his God".

"Behold I raise up against you the Chaldeans, the warlike ones, the nation bitter and hasty". Lauterburg asks if the text as we have it here would not warrant us in making "Chaldeans" to stand in apposition to "you" rather than to have the three substantives as mutually independent of each other. On this view the Chaldeans would not be regarded as the avengers announced, but as the oppressors. He thinks the word "warlike" dropped out of the ext; and so the original reading was probably as follows;

[illegible]

may have been translated [illegible] by reason of its affinity with [illegible] to strive, to contend, and [illegible] would be found in the original only because of the confusion of ר and ד , and of ב and כ .

As a proof that the Persians are meant here, he calls attention to the fact that their cavalry was described as being swift. This is shown further in 1:7 in the expression "It is from himself that his judgment and dignity proceed." He takes this to refer to Cyrus who designated himself the king of Persia only after the Lydian conquests. In this Cyrus was like the first Prussian king who said "Ex me mea nota Corona."

Lauterburg makes another ingenious modification of the text. He changes v. 11 so as to make it read as follows:

[illegible]

"Then he changes his disposition,- that is to say, his warlike thoughts give place to pious ones",- or: "Then his heart is lifted up--and he kindles the fire, sacrificing to his God".

Instead of the haughty impiety which the Massorete attributed to the invaders we are invited to find in them models of gratitude and religion.

Again, the evils mentioned in 1:13-17 were not caused by the new conquerors, the Persians; the author is still speaking of the Chaldean oppressors as if the new conquerors had not yet come.

As was said with reference to Duhm, the attempt to read כַּשְׂדִּים out of the text is an extreme measure. All the versions retain the term "the Chaldeans"; and while we might accept Lauterburg's rendering of the variant which has the ambiguity, if it were the only source we had, yet in view of the fact that the Massoretic text and all other versions not only retain the term "the Chaldeans" but make them the invaders rather than the victims, we can hardly do other than abide by the M. T.

Nor is it very convincing to give as a reason for the belief that the invaders are Persians the fact that they are described as having swift cavalry. As Nicolardot says, Budde thought that of the Assyrian cavalry; Duhm of the Greeks under Alexander; and others of the Scythians. Nor does the comparison of them to leopards and eagles apply any more to the Persians than to anybody else. It only serves to make the idea of their swiftness more vivid.

Again, take Lauterburg's modification of v. 11. Granted that it is ingenious, it hardly fits in with the evident thought of the rest of the chapter, which is describing a haughty conqueror against whom the prophet complains further in the next section. Nor is Lauterburg's solution of the difficulty he

Instead of the haughty impiety which the Massoretic attributed to the invaders we are invited to find in them models of gratitude and religion.

Again, the evils mentioned in 1:13-17 were not caused by the new conquerors, the Persians; the author is still speaking of the Chaldean oppressors as if the new conquerors had not yet come.

As was said with reference to Duhm, the attempt to read out of the text is an extreme measure. All the versions retain the term "the Chaldeans"; and while we might accept Lauterburg's rendering of the variant which has the ambiguity, if it were the only source we had, yet in view of the fact that the Massoretic text and all other versions not only retain the term "the Chaldeans" but make them the invaders rather than the victims, we can hardly do other than abide by the M. T.

Nor is it very convincing to give as a reason for the belief that the invaders are Persians the fact that they are described as having swift cavalry. As Nicolardot says, Budde thought that of the Assyrian cavalry; Duhm of the Greeks under Alexander; and others of the Scythians. Nor does the comparison of them to leopards and eagles apply any more to the Persians than to anybody else. It only serves to make the idea of their swiftness more vivid.

Again, take Lauterburg's modification of v. 11. Granted that it is ingenious, it hardly fits in with the evident thought of the rest of the chapter, which is describing a haughty conqueror against whom the prophet complains further in the next section. Nor is Lauterburg's solution of the difficulty be

finds himself in, with respect to the continued complainings of the prophet after the liberating Persians had come, very convincing. It would be very strange if they continued to complain so bitterly after deliverance had come.

Then, note the complete change in the disposition of the conquerors after they have overcome their victims. Their warlike thoughts give place to pious ones. Gratitude and thankfulness fill their hearts and they sacrifice to their God. As Nicolardot says[1], "It would seem strange for a Hebrew prophet to felicitate the Persians on sacrificing to their God."

We have purposely omitted consideration of one of the most widespread hypotheses of the Book of Habakkuk until the last, because of the large number of those who accept it, and because, in many ways, it so nearly approximates the view of the writer. The hypothesis in question is that advanced by A. B. Davidson.[2] After calling attention to difficulties found in 1:2-4, 1:5-11, 1:12-17, he expresses the view that ch. 1:1-4 may be understood as a complaint regarding internal wrong and injustice in Israel, after the manner of all the ancient prophets. To avenge this injustice the Chaldeans are raised up, but the more terrible wrong-doing of the Chaldean gives the prophet a greater problem, and he appeals to Yahweh for a solution of it. He receives an answer to the effect that only the righteous man should live, and he by his faithfulness. It is Davidson's view that at the time when the prophet writes, the Chaldeans had long been on the stage of history, and

1 - La Composition Du Livre D'Habacuc, p. 48.

2 - Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, pp. 45-94.

finds himself in, with respect to the continued complainings of the prophet after the liberating Persians had come, very convincing. It would be very strange if they continued to complain so bitterly after deliverance had come.

Then, note the complete change in the disposition of the conquerors after they have overcome their victims. Their warlike thoughts give place to pious ones. Gratitude and thankfulness fill their hearts and they sacrifice to their God. As Nicolardot says[1], "It would seem strange for a Hebrew prophet to felicitate the Persians on sacrificing to their God."

We have purposely omitted consideration of one of the most widespread hypotheses of the Book of Habakkuk until the last, because of the large number of those who accept it, and because, in many ways, it so nearly approximates the view of the writer. The hypothesis in question is that advanced by A. B. Davidson.[2] After calling attention to difficulties found in 1:2-4, 1:5-11, 1:12-17, he expresses the view that ch. 1:1-4 may be understood as a complaint regarding internal wrong and injustice in Israel, after the manner of all the ancient prophets. To avenge this injustice the Chaldeans are raised up, but the more terrible wrong-doing of the Chaldean gives the prophet a greater problem, and he appeals to Yahweh for a solution of it. He receives an answer to the effect that only the righteous man should live, and he by his faithfulness. It is Davidson's view that at the time when the prophet writes, the Chaldeans had long been on the stage of history, and

1 - La Composition Du Livre D'Habacuc, p. 48.

2 - Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, pp. 45-94.

were well known in Western Asia. He, therefore, thinks 1:5-11 is not a prophecy of the raising up of the Chaldeans, "except in form". "It is a reference to the past, an explanation merely of their presence and meaning as instruments of Jehovah." The real subject of the book, in his opinion, is the destruction of the Chaldeans. While he admits that this view of the book has something artificial about it, it seems to have fewer difficulties than other views. He would date it not earlier than 597 B. C.

With this view Driver, Orelli, and Kirkpatrick practically agree.

This theory has much to commend it, in that it relieves the great difficulty of ch. 1 by throwing back 1:5-11 to a date prior to 1:12ff. It seems to the writer, however, that the suggestion that 1;5-11 is not a prophecy "except in form", is too strong an implication that the main idea in prophecy is prediction. As we say elsewhere, prediction is only a subordinate element in prophecy. The main business of the prophet has to declare the will and purpose of God in any given situation. There is something artificial about Davidson's construction when on thinks of prophecy as prediction, and takes the view that 1:5-11 was simply a dramatic representation of what had been revealed to the prophet years before; but when we emphasize the declaration of the purpose and will of God as the main thing in prophecy, and think of the whole of chs. 1 and 2 as representing "the communing and questioning of the prophet's soul with God" over a prolonged period, then the form in which the prophet expresses what he conceives to be the will of God in this connection, becomes a

were well known in Western Asia. He, therefore, thinks I:5-11 is not a prophecy of the raising up of the Chaldeans, "except in form". "It is a reference to the past, an explanation merely of their presence and meaning as instruments of Jehovah." The real subject of the book, in his opinion, is the destruction of the Chaldeans. While he admits that this view of the book has something artificial about it, it seems to have fewer difficulties than other views. He would date it not earlier than 597 B. C.

With this view Driver, Orelli, and Kirkpatrick practically agree.

This theory has much to commend it, in that it relieves the great difficulty of ch. I by throwing back I:5-11 to a date prior to I:1ff. It seems to the writer, however, that the suggestion that I:5-11 is not a prophecy "except in form", is too strong an implication that the main idea in prophecy is prediction. As we say elsewhere, prediction is only a subordinate element in prophecy. The main business of the prophet has to declare the will and purpose of God in any given situation. There is something artificial about Davidson's construction when on thinks of prophecy as prediction, and takes the view that I:5-11 was simply a dramatic representation of what had been revealed to the prophet years before; but when we emphasize the declaration of the purpose and will of God as the main thing in prophecy, and think of the whole of chs. 1 and 2 as representing "the communing and questioning of the prophet's soul with God" over a prolonged period, then the form in which the prophet expresses what he conceives to be the will of God in this connection, becomes a

secondary matter.

We agree with Davidson that it could not have been written earlier than 597 B. C., but go further, as will be seen in a later chapter, and assert that it not only was not written earlier than 597 B. C., but most likely not earlier than the period immediately following the fall of Jerusalem (586-585 B.C.).

Our criticism of the main theories in connection with the book of Habakkuk is now ended. No one of them, in our view, is entirely satisfactory; and only two of them have had any appreciable degree of acceptation among scholars. These two are: (1) the view of Budde, who thought the Chaldeans were raised up to punish the Assyrian oppressors, named in 1:2-4, and who would have 1:5-11 follow 2:4; (2) The view of Davidson, expressed above, who regarded the "wicked" and "righteous", in 1:2-4, as referring to two classes of Jews in Judah, one of whom the Chaldeans were raised up to punish.

Perhaps the problem is not soluble, but this will not deter the present writer from presenting the results of his own patient, and reverent study of this most wonderful little book; nor will it hamper any of us a great deal in our appreciation of Habakkuk's spiritual attitude and poetic gifts.

secondary matter.

We agree with Davidson that it could not have been written earlier than 597 B. C., but go further, as will be seen in a later chapter, and assert that it not only was not written earlier than 597 B. C., but most likely not earlier than the period immediately following the fall of Jerusalem (588-585 B.C.).

Our criticism of the main theories in connection with the book of Habakkuk is now ended. No one of them, in our view, is entirely satisfactory; and only two of them have had any appreciable degree of acceptation among scholars. These two are: (1) the view of Budde, who thought the Chaldeans were raised up to punish the Assyrian oppressors, named in 1:2-4, and who would have 1:5-11 follow 2:4; (2) The view of Davidson, expressed above, who regarded the "wicked" and "righteous", in 1:2-4, as referring to two classes of Jews in Judah, one of whom the Chaldeans were raised up to punish.

Perhaps the problem is not soluble, but this will not deter the present writer from presenting the results of his own patient, and reverent study of this most wonderful little book; nor will it hamper any of us a great deal in our appreciation of Habakkuk's spiritual attitude and poetic gifts.

II. THE MOST SATISFACTORY SOLUTION OF THE CRITICAL PROBLEMS OF THE BOOK.

Chapter IV.

SOLUTION OF PROBLEMS, OTHER THAN DATE.

In the preceding chapter we have made an exhaustive study of the efforts of scholarship, both ancient and modern, to solve the problems connected with the book of Habakkuk. While most of the proposed solutions of the problems in the book are doubtless valuable contributions to their ultimate solution, no one of them is entirely satisfactory. It thus becomes the duty, no less than the privilege, of the writer to present his own conclusions with reference to these difficult problems.

Our first difficulty is the question of the identity of the "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:2-4. Who are the "wicked" who are responsible for destruction and violence; who bring about strife and contention? Who are they who cause the "Torah" to be slacked; the righteous to go forth perverted? It does seem to the writer that "the most natural sense of the verses and of the words used in them" would make them refer to two classes of Jews, in Judah. "Destruction and violence" might, and do to a number of scholars, suggest an outside oppressor, but how much more suggestive are the following terms and expressions: "There is strife, and contention ariseth". Where more naturally could the prophet justly complain of "strife" and "contention" than among his own fellow-countrymen? Then follows language more suggestive still: "The Torah is slacked, and Justice (Mishpat) never goes forth". How characteristic of the Hebrew prophet, after 621 B. C., to link up in his preaching the "Torah" and "Mishpat," both fundamentals of the prophetic teaching. But who, "among the nations", could fully appreciate this language? Only the prophet's countrymen, the Jews. It would seem to be evident, then, that the terms

In the preceding chapter we have made an exhaustive study of the efforts of scholarship, both ancient and modern, to solve the problems connected with the book of Habakkuk. While most of the proposed solutions of the problems in the book are doubtless valuable contributions to their ultimate solution, no one of them is entirely satisfactory. It thus becomes the duty, no less than the privilege, of the writer to present his own conclusions with reference to these difficult problems.

Our first difficulty is the question of the identity of the "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:2-4. Who are the "wicked" who are responsible for destruction and violence; who bring about strife and contention? Who are they who cause the "Torah" to be slacked; the rights to go forth perverted? It does seem to the writer that "the most natural sense of the verses and of the words used in them" would make them refer to two classes of Jews in Judah. "Destruction and violence" might, and do to a number of scholars, suggest an outside oppressor, but how much more suggestive are the following terms and expressions: "There is strife, and contention ariseth". Where more naturally could the prophet justly complain of "strife" and "contention" than among his own fellow-countrymen? Then follows language more suggestive still: "The Torah is slacked, and justice (Mishpat) never goes forth". How characteristic of the Hebrew prophet, after 621 B. C., to link up in his preaching the "Torah" and "Mishpat," both fundamentals of the prophetic teaching. But who, "among the nations", could fully appreciate this language? Only the prophet's countrymen, the Jews. It would seem to be evident, then, that the terms

refer to two classes of Jews in Judah.

As to the relation of the terms "wicked" and "righteous" in vv 1:2-4 and 1:13 there seems to the writer no necessity that the terms should refer to the same people in both cases. Indeed the context seems all against such a view. The wicked in v. 4 are, without doubt, those who are responsible for the Torah's being slacked and Mishpat's going forth perverted. These terms, as we have said before, would most naturally apply to two classes in Judah. The use of "wicked" in v. 13 is, if anything, more clear in its reference to the arrogant and cruel foreign oppressors. The terms used here are relative. The righteous Jew in v. 13 is only "righteous" as compared with the more "wicked" Chaldean. As compared with a more righteous Jew, the first "righteous" may have been wicked.

Another problem is the connection of 1:5-11 with 1:2-4. In the view of the writer 1:5-11 represents the response of Yahweh to the complaints of the prophet in vv. 2-4, and is simply one phase of the prophet's contemplation of the long line of disasters that have attended his nation's career for a number of years.

These verses doubtless represented the frame of mind with which the average Israelite, especially those of the prophetic party, observed the advance of the Chaldeans early in their career, say probably in the reign of Jehoiakim. When they noted how far away from Josiah's ideals the people had fallen, and how little the spirit of the Deuteronomic reforms was being observed, they felt that such a course would lead to the coming of an instrument of judgment. This they conceived to be the Chaldeans, and at first raised no objections. Later, however, when they came to know

refer to two classes of Jews in Judah.

As to the relation of the terms "wicked" and "righteous" in vv 1:3-4 and 1:13 there seems to the writer no necessity that the terms should refer to the same people in both cases. Indeed the context seems all against such a view. The wicked in v. 4 are, without doubt, those who are responsible for the Torah's being slacked and Mispat's going forth perverted. These terms, as we have said before, would most naturally apply to two classes in Judah. The use of "wicked" in v. 13 is, if anything, more clear in its reference to the arrogant and cruel foreign oppressors. The terms used here are relative. The righteous for in v. 13 is only "righteous" as compared with the more "wicked" Chaldean. As compared with a more righteous Jew, the first "righteous" may have been wicked.

Another problem is the connection of 1:5-11 with 1:2-4. In the view of the writer 1:5-11 represents the response of Yahweh to the complaints of the prophet in vv. 2-4, and is simply one phase of the prophet's contemplation of the long line of disasters that have attended his nation's career for a number of years.

These verses doubtless represented the frame of mind with which the average Israelite, especially those of the prophetic party, observed the advance of the Chaldeans early in their career, any probably in the reign of Jehoiakim. When they noted how far away from Judah's ideals the people had fallen, and how little the spirit of the Deuteronomic reforms was being observed, they felt that such a course would lead to the coming of an instrument of judgment. This they conceived to be the Chaldeans, and at first raised no objections. Later, however, when they came to know

more about the Chaldeans they could not see how Yahweh could use such instruments as they.

All of this passes in review before the reflective mind of our prophet, who now attempts to speak words of comfort to those who are as sheep without a shepherd. In these verses he is simply reminded of the rich promise and glorious expectation aroused in Israel when the Chaldeans were first announced. Now, however, that picture has all gone. Instead, the Chaldeans have become a haughty tyrant, carrying the Jews away as captives to a strange land.

Another difficulty is encountered in the passage, ch. 2:9-20. A number of scholars have contended that the genuine prophecy of Habakkuk goes no farther than ch. 2:8. This view is discussed at length by Kuenen in his book Historisch-Criticish Ondezoek, II Leiden, 1889, p. 386-395 ff. With reference to the strophe contained in vv. 9-11, "Woe to him that gaineth evil gain to his house that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the hand of evil etc.", Kuenen thinks that this could be hardly said of the Chaldeans. He can not see what need they have to be delivered "from the hand of evil". Davidson (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, p. 56) admits that we have a difficulty here, but insists that "delivered from evil" need not imply present danger. It may refer either to present or prospective danger. Davidson further points out with reference to the difficulty in v. 10, "Thou hast devised shame to thy house by cutting off many peoples, and hast sinned against thy soul", that we have a parallel in Isaiah 14:2 in the words, "Thou hast destroyed thy lands and slain thy people." This meant, of course, that because the king of

more about the Chaldeans they could not see how Yahweh could use such instruments as they.

All of this passes in review before the reflective mind of our prophet, who now attempts to speak words of comfort to those who are as sheep without a shepherd. In these verses he is simply reminded of the rich promise and glorious expectation aroused in Israel when the Chaldeans were first announced. Now, however, that picture has all gone. Instead, the Chaldeans have become a haughty tyrant, carrying the Jews away as captives to a strange land.

Another difficulty is encountered in the passage, ch. 2:5-20. A number of scholars have contended that the genuine prophecy of Habakkuk goes no further than ch. 2:8. This view is discussed at length by Kuenen in his book Historisch-Critisch Onderzoek, II Deiden, 1889, p. 385-393 ff. With reference to the strophe contained in vv. 9-11, "Woe to Him that gaineth evil gain to his house that he may set his nest on high, that he may be delivered from the hand of evil etc.", Kuenen thinks that this could be hardly said of the Chaldeans. He can not see what need they have to be delivered "From the hand of evil". Davidson (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, p. 86) admits that we have a difficulty here, but insists that "delivered from evil" need not imply present danger. It may refer either to present or prospective danger. Davidson further points out with reference to the difficulty in v. 13, "Thou hast devised shame to thy house by cutting off many peoples, and hast sinned against thy soul", that we have a parallel in Isaian 14:2 in the words, "Thou hast destroyed thy land and slain thy people." This meant, of course, that because the king of

Babylon had acted as a cruel tyrant he had made inevitable the ultimate destruction of his own land and the slaying of his own people. So here in Habakkuk it was a prophecy of the ultimate effect on his own people that the tyrannical ruler would have. Davidson thinks that Kuenen's objections to the strophe vv. 12-14 which appears to contain reminiscences of several passages, some of which are late, is more plausible. With reference to Kuenen's doubts that the idolators in vv. 18-20 could refer to the Chaldeans, and his belief that the reference must be to persons who knew better than to be idolaters, Davidson replies, "what the prophet assails in these verses is idolatry in itself, the idolatry of the heathen." On the whole Davidson thinks the objections to vv. 9-20 are not very weighty.

The majority of critics agree with Davidson in the view that, for the most part, vv. 9-20 are authentic.

Such unanimity on the part of critical scholarship as to the authenticity of these vv. 9-20 would seem a strong presumption in their favor. And with the general position taken above, the writer is in hearty agreement and wishes to add the following suggestions which in his mind tend to strengthen the view that the verses are authentic.

Nothing is more evident to the student of Habakkuk than the fact that the prophet himself was a student of the prophecies of Isaiah and apparently an admirer of Israel's greatest prophet. As Betteridge has shown (although with a different motive), there are many parallels between the Book of Isaiah and the Book of Habakkuk. And one of the most marked similarities between the two is the "woes" pronounced upon sinful peoples whether Jews or

Babylon had acted as a cruel tyrant he had made inevitable the ultimate destruction of his own land and the slaying of his own people. So here in Habakkuk it was a prophecy of the ultimate effect on his own people that the tyrannical ruler would have. Davidson thinks that Kuenen's objections to the strophe vv. 12-14 which appears to contain reminiscences of several passages, some of which are late, is more plausible. With reference to Kuenen's doubts that the idolatres in vv. 18-20 could refer to the Chaldeans, and his belief that this reference must be to persons who knew better than to be idolatres, Davidson replies, "What the prophet assails in these verses is idolatry in itself, the idolatry of the heathen." On the whole Davidson thinks the objections to vv. 9-20 are not very weighty.

The majority of critics agree with Davidson in the view that, for the most part, vv. 9-20 are authentic.

Such unanimity on the part of critical scholarship as to the authenticity of these vv. 9-20 would seem a strong presumption in their favor. And with the general position taken above, the writer is in hearty agreement and wishes to add the following suggestions which in his mind tend to strengthen the view that the verses are authentic.

Nothing is more evident to the student of Habakkuk than the fact that the prophet himself was a student of the prophecies of Isaiah and apparently an admirer of Isaiah's greatest prophet. As Betteridge has shown (although with a different motive), there are many parallels between the Book of Isaiah and the Book of Habakkuk. And one of the most marked similarities between the two is the "woes" pronounced upon sinful peoples whether Jews or

foreign oppressors. Compare Habakkuk 2:6ff with Isaiah 5:18-26, 10:1-4. Then note the judgment pronounced upon Assyria in ch. 10:5ff.

Again note in this passage (Isa. 10:5ff) the similarity of the roles to be played by the two peoples, the Assyrians and Chaldeans. The Assyrians were to be the rod of Yahweh's anger, and the staff of his indignation. He planned to send them against his rebellious people, but in Yahweh's mind the Assyrians were simply his instruments of punishment. They were expected to be amenable to Yahweh but the Assyrians themselves did not have this view of it. When the Assyrian king had accomplished his mighty works he gave none of the credit to Yahweh, but said, "By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom".

How like Habakkuk's characterization of the Chaldean in ch. 2:4 this. And the fact that Isaiah utters a malediction, or a series of them, against the Assyrian because he was the character the prophet described, is a strong argument to the effect that his young admirer of more than a century later, who followed him in so many things, would imitate him in this matter of utteringmaledictions against a tyrannical foe.

And finally some such maledictions were necessary to meet the exigencies of the situation described by the prophet in the preceding passage. These people who were terrible and dreadful; who dealt treacherously; who made men as fishes of the sea, as the creeping things that have no ruler over them, must needs be punished; not merely for the satisfaction it would give their enemies, but to prove the assertion of Yahweh, that the righteous should live, and the proud and haughty perish.

foreign oppressors. Compare Habakkuk 3:8ff with Isaiah 5:18-26, 10:1-4. Then note the judgment pronounced upon Assyria in ch. 10:5ff.

Again note in this passage (Isa. 10:5ff) the similarity of the roles to be played by the two peoples, the Assyrians and Chaldeans. The Assyrians were to be the rod of Yahweh's anger, and the staff of his indignation. He planned to send them against his rebellious people, but in Yahweh's mind the Assyrians were simply his instruments of punishment. They were expected to be amenable to Yahweh but the Assyrians themselves did not have this view of it. When the Assyrian king had accomplished his mighty works he gave none of the credit to Yahweh, but said, "By the strength of my hand I have done it, and by my wisdom". How like Habakkuk's characterization of the Chaldean in ch. 2:4 this. And the fact that Isaiah utters a malediction, or a series of them, against the Assyrian because he was the character the prophet described, is a strong argument to the effect that his young admirer of more than a century later, who followed him in so many things, would imitate him in this matter of utterimprecations against a tyrannical foe.

And finally were such maledictions were necessary to meet the exigencies of the situation described by the prophet in the preceding passage. Those people who were terrible and dreadful; who dealt treacherously; who made men as fishes of the sea, as the creeping things that have no ruler over them, must needs be punished; not merely for the satisfaction it would give their enemies, but to prove the assertion of Yahweh, that the righteous should live, and the proud and haughty perish.

So we agree with the great body of critical scholars, that while this series of maledictions has probably been worked over, and possibly enlarged by interpolation, it is in the main authentic.

Chapter 3. The last problem usually raised in connection with the integrity of the Book of Habakkuk, is that touching the authenticity of the 3rd chapter. Was this chapter written by Habakkuk or does it come from a later hand? Was it originally a unity with chs. 1 and 2, or were they put together by an editor many years later? With reference to these questions there is considerable difference of opinion among scholars.

Some prominent modern scholars take the view that the Psalm comes from Habakkuk. For example Betteridge (Amer. Jour. Theo., 1903, pp. 647-661) says: "The third chapter is a Psalm but that does not settle the question of its authorship. If there are pre-exilic Psalms the question arises first, is there any satisfactory objection to the early origin of this supposed pre-exilix piece? Second, can this Psalm be satisfactorily explained out of the same historical circumstances as the rest of the prophecy? There is no satisfactory reason to be urged against the date of the Psalm; nor is there any reason for denying its reputed authorship." In Betteridge's view prophecy was seeking to lead people to submit to the inevitable catastrophe. Many Psalms were called forth in those dark days. In the midst of the devastation that he sees, the prophet is convinced that Yahweh will deliver his people. Nor does Betteridge think there is any incongruity in language or style as between the Psalm and the rest of the prophecy. The circumstances furnished the occasion for such a Psalm as this. He maintains, therefore, that the Psalm is from the same hand and

brain as the rest of the prophecy.

However, most modern scholars take the view that chapter 3 did not originally belong with chapters 1 and 2; that they were not written by the same author; nor do they reflect the same background.

Davidson (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, p. 58) refers to Kuenen's view that the hymn once belonged to a book of sacred songs, from which it had been transferred to the Book of the Prophet, probably because ascribed to him in a title just as certain psalms are ascribed in the LXX to the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. Davidson holds that on this supposition the authorship of Habakkuk would be very uncertain, for even with the Psalter, the names of authors given in the titles to Psalms are nothing more than conjectures or traditions of more or less antiquity. He thinks that the alternative supposition would be that the Psalm is an integral part of the prophecy but was used in the liturgical services. This would account for the musical directions in it. Davidson adds, however, "Such a use of any part of a prophetic book has no parallel."

To the writer it seems clear that ch. 3 is a separate production, and was originally no part of the prophecy contained in the first two chapters.

In the first place this poem does not seem to reflect the historical situation set forth in chs. 1 and 2. For example note the difference in the prayers of the writers in chs. 1:2-4 and 3:2. In ch. 1:2-4 the prophet has a different problem to solve. He is trying to interest Yahweh in the chaotic conditions that obtain among the prophet's own people and perhaps their neighbors. He faces the problem of the injustices heaped upon the weak by the

brain as the rest of the prophecy.

However, most modern scholars take the view that chapter 3 did not originally belong with chapters 1 and 2; that they were not written by the same author; nor do they reflect the same background. Davidson (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges, p. 50) refers to Hupfeld's view that the Hymn once belonged to a book of sacred songs, from which it had been transferred to the Book of the Prophet, probably because ascribed to him in a title just as certain psalms are ascribed in the INDEX to the prophets Haggai and Zechariah. Davidson holds that on this supposition the authorship of Habakkuk would be very uncertain, for even with the Psalter, the names of authors given in the titles to Psalms are nothing more than conjectures or traditions of more or less antiquity. He thinks that the alternative supposition would be that the Psalm is an integral part of the prophecy but was used in the liturgical services. This would account for the musical directions in it. Davidson adds, however, "Such a use of any part of a prophetic book has no parallel."

To the writer it seems clear that ch. 3 is a separate production, and was originally no part of the prophecy contained in the first two chapters.

In the first place this poem does not seem to reflect the historical situation set forth in chs. 1 and 2. For example note the difference in the prayers of the writers in chs. 1:2-4 and 3:2. In ch. 1:2-4 the prophet has a different problem to solve. He is trying to interest Yahweh in the chaotic conditions that obtain among the prophet's own people and perhaps their neighbors. He faces the problem of the injustices heaped upon the weak by the

strong. He does not understand why this condition of things is allowed to continue, and so asks Yahweh the "why" of it. The problem is not lessened in 1:6-11 when he is told the character of the people who will be used as Yahweh's instruments of justice. He dares to question the justice of Yahweh himself in his handling of this situation.

The situation suggested in 3:2 is that of a devout and God-fearing student of his country's history and his nation's God. He is writing in a perfectly calm and dispassionate way. There is no suggestion of storm and stress, so far as the writer is concerned; no indication of deep anguish and troubled spirit over the gloomy outlook for his nation. He is singing of Yahweh's lovingkindness "in the midst of the years". He has heard full many a time the thrilling account of how Yahweh led Israel by the hand of Moses from Egypt to the "promised land". He has heard of their settlement in Canaan and how Yahweh made them victors over their enemies. He has heard of the remarkable work of David and Solomon and their successors and is filld with admiration for them all and for Yahweh who directed them. So he says, as he thinks of all these things: "Oh, Yahweh, I have heard the report of thee and am afraid." He wants Yahweh to revive his work in the midst of the years. Contrast the words here, "I have heard the report of thee and am afraid", with the prophet's boldness in ch. 2:1: "I will stand upon my watch-tower and station myself upon the fortress, and I will look out to see what he will say to me, and what I shall answer concerning my complaint." It is evident that the two passages could not have been written by the same man in the same frame of mind; and there is no question as to the authenticity of

ch. 2:1.

The theophany which follows 3:2, and extends to 3:13, shows the same dissimilarity, in a historical way, with chs. 1 and 2, as the passage quoted above. In ch. 2:5ff. we have the "woes" to be inflicted on the Chaldeans by various nations. The Chaldeans are to be severely punished by these nations. Ultimately the religion of Yahweh will be established throughout the earth. "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh as the waters cover the sea."

In ch. 3:3-13 the writer sets forth the manifestations in nature. Yahweh came from Teman and Mt. Paran. His glory covered the heavens. Before him went pestilence. He scattered the mountains and the hills and drove asunder the nations. We find nothing in common with chs. 1 and 2, where the prophet's concern is the coming of better times to Israel, and the inevitable fate of such a nation as the Chaldeans. This dissimilarity is more and more apparent as one studies the Psalm and compares it with the two preceding chapters. Chapter 3 is a beautiful ode setting forth in thrilling form the majesty and supremacy of Yahweh, but all the evidence both external and internal suggests that it was a separate production, and originally formed no part of the prophecy.

Now whence comes this mysterious ode and how does it happen to be found in the book of Habakkuk? These are problems that are perhaps insoluble, certainly in any absolute and final way; but there is certain evidence within the Psalm itself which tends to throw light on its early connection if not its original composition. Note first the title, "A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet set to shigionoth." While scholars are not certain as to the exact meaning

ch. 2:1.

The theophany which follows 3:3, and extends to 3:15, shows the same dissimilarity, in a historical way, with chs. 1 and 2, as the passage quoted above. In ch. 3:3ff. we have the "woes" to be inflicted on the Chaldeans by various nations. The Chaldeans are to be severely punished by these nations. Ultimately the religion of Yahweh will be established throughout the earth. "The earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh as the waters cover the sea."

In ch. 3:3-15 the writer sets forth the manifestations in nature. Yahweh came from Teman and Mt. Paran. His glory covered the heavens. Before him went pestilence. He scattered the mountains and the hills and drove asunder the nations. We find nothing in common with chs. 1 and 2, where the prophet's concern is the coming of better times to Israel, and the inevitable fate of such a nation as the Chaldeans. This dissimilarity is more and more apparent as one studies the Psalm and compares it with the two preceding chapters. Chapter 3 is a bountiful ode setting forth in thrilling form the majesty and supremacy of Yahweh, but all the evidence both external and internal suggests that it was a separate production, and originally formed no part of the prophecy.

How wrongs comes this mysterious addition how does it happen to be found in the book of Habakkuk? These are problems that are perhaps insoluble, certainly in any absolute and final way; but there is certain evidence within the Psalm itself which tends to throw light on its early connection if not its original composition. Note first the title, "A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet set to singsong." While scholars are not certain as to the exact meanin

of the term "shigionoth" all agree that it is a musical term; and its presence in this ode would suggest that the Psalm was used in the temple worship. The term is also found in Psa. 7:1. This Psalm (7:1) is known to have been one of the hymns in the earliest collection known as the "Psalter of David". The fact that we have here the same title as that used by one of the hymns known to be in the collection for temple worship is strongly suggestive of the common origin and similar use of the two poems.

Then, note the musical sign "Selah". According to C. A. Briggs (Psalms vol. 1, p. LXXX, Int. Crit. Com.) Selah indicates the abbreviation of a song in liturgical use, and marks the place where the closing benediction might be sung. It is found 71 times in the Hebrew text, and except for the three times found in this chapter, is found nowhere else but in the Psalms, in 39 of which it occurs. This is a strong argument for the view that the ode was originally one of the Psalms and used in the temple worship.

Finally, note the subscription after v. 19, "For the Chief Musician, on my stringed instruments." The term in the Hebrew text is לַמְנַצֵּחַ. This Dr. Briggs (Psalms, vol. 1, p. LXXII, Int. Crit. Com.) takes to mean "Belonging to the Director". There was a collection of fifty-five Psalms, collected in the middle Greek period in Palestine for use in the synagogues, which have the title לַמְנַצֵּחַ.

In view of the fact that Habakkuk 3 uses the term לַמְנַצֵּחַ as part of its title, Briggs thinks this Psalm was originally a part of that collection known as "Belonging to the Director". Later it was removed to Habakkuk.

This would suggest the middle Greek period as the time when the Psalm was taken from the Psalter and added to the book of Habakkuk.

From this nothing may be inferred as to the original composition of the poem, since the larger collection was made up from previous minor Psalters, and Stonehouse may be correct in his conjecture that vv 3-15 came from the later Monarchy. There is nothing in the Psalm itself which precludes such an early origin.

We would conclude, then, that the Psalm in ch. 3 did not originally belong to the prophecy of Habakkuk. It was, before its connection with the Book of Habakkuk, one of the hymns in a collection known as "Belonging to the Director". Here it was found by the editor of the Book of Habakkuk, probably a Levite, who felt that it would form a fitting close to one of the most unique little books ever written.

Chapter V.

THE DATE OF HABAKKUK
AND THE
INTERPRETATION OF THE BOOK.

Chapter V.

THE DATE OF ISAIAH XLIX.
AND THE
INTERPRETATION OF THE BOOK.

One of the most difficult problems connected with the book of Habakkuk is the matter of the date of the prophecy. Even among scholars who are in practical agreement about other problems connected with the book there are, as we have seen, the most divergent views with reference to its date.

For example Pusey (Minor Prophets, vol. 2, pp. 167 ff) takes the view that Habakkuk's ministry fell in the latter half of the reign of Manasseh or the earlier half of that of Josiah. This would be between 645 B.C. and 625 B.C. He regards the prophecy as a prediction. He gives two reasons for the dates he suggests. First, the prophet's statement that he was working a work in their day; second, the fact that the invasion was "incredible" to those to whom the prophet was speaking. The last would suggest that Nineveh had not yet been overthrown by Babylon. The first reason would suggest that it would happen in the life time of many of those to whom the prophet was speaking; the second, that it was prior to the capture of Nineveh by the Chaldeans (625 B.C.).

Delitzsch (Keil and Delitzsch--Com. on Minor Prophets, p. 49ff) takes the view that it cannot go beyond Josiah's reign, because the prophet is not speaking to the children, in his words, "I am working a work in your day," but to the adults. However, he thinks since there were only 38 years between the death of Manasseh and the first invasion of the Chaldeans, the Chaldean's judgment might well be announced during the last years of Manasseh.

Orelli (O. T. Prophecy p. 329) places it before the year 605, the year of the battle of Carchemish, on the ground that after

One of the most difficult problems connected with the book of Habakkuk is the matter of the date of the prophecy. Even among scholars who are in practical agreement about other problems connected with the book there are, as we have seen, the most divergent views with reference to the date.

For example Duesy (Minor Prophets, vol. 2, pp. 107 ff) takes the view that Habakkuk's ministry fell in the latter half of the reign of Manasseh or the earlier half of that of Josiah. This would be between 640 B.C. and 625 B.C. He regards the prophecy as a prediction. He gives two reasons for the dates he suggests. First, the prophet's statement that he was working a work in their day; second, the fact that the invasion was "incredible" to those to whom the prophet was speaking. The last would suggest that Nineveh had not yet been overthrown by Babylon. The first reason would suggest that it would happen in the life time of many of those to whom the prophet was speaking; the second, that it was prior to the capture of Nineveh by the Chaldeans (625 B.C.).

Pulpit (Keil and Delitzsch--Com. on Minor Prophets, p. 497 ff) takes the view that it cannot go beyond Josiah's reign, because the prophet is not speaking to the children, in this words, "I am working a work in your day," but to the adults. However, he thinks since there were only 30 years between the death of Manasseh and the first invasion of the Chaldeans, the Chaldean's judgment might well be announced during the last years of Manasseh.

Orelli (O. T. Prophecy p. 330) places it before the year 605, the year of the battle of Carchemish, on the ground that after

that battle it was almost self evident that the Chaldean on his victorious march against Egypt would also visit Judah.

Davidson (Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges p. 53) thinks that the description of the Chaldeans given in 1:5-11 is scarcely conceivable before the battle of Carchemish (605-4). With this Driver (Century Bible p. 53) agrees. Budde (Expositor, May 1893, pp. 372-385) thinks the prophecy was about 615 B. C.

With this George Adam Smith (The Twelve Prophets, vol. 2, p. 124) agrees, if the tyrant spoken of in 1:2-4 is Assyria. But, if, as he thinks possible, it is Egypt, then he would date it from 608 to 605 B. C.

On the other hand some scholars like Duhm, Happel, and Lauterburg would assign the whole book to a very late date: Duhm 334-331 B. C.; Happel 170 B. C.; Lauterburg to the Persian period.

It seems clear from evidence contained in the book that it was written while the events which culminated in the Chaldean conquest of the kingdom of Judah were fresh in the minds of both writer and his readers. This seems especially true of the first two chapters. Several passages suggest this. For example, we read in 1:5-6 "I am working a work in your days, which ye will not believe though it be told you. For lo I am raising up the Chaldeans that bitter and hasty nation etc." The expression "In your days" suggests the present or very near future. Left unsupported it would not be very clear just when "your days" meant, but the following statement to the effect that it is the Chaldeans who will be raised up is a strong, and to the writer's mind, a practically conclusive argument that the date is the Chaldean period, Duhm, Lauterburg and others to the contrary, notwithstanding.

Taking it for granted that it was written during the Chaldean period, it must have been written between 625 B. C. and 538 B. C. In 625 B. C. Nabopolasser, a man of energy and enterprise, had become ruler of Babylon. At first he was viceroy under the suzerainty of Assyria. In 611 or 612 he declared his independence. In 607 Nineveh was laid in ruins by Nabopolasser, assisted by the Umaman-Manda (one of the tribes of the North, probably the Medes). The victory of Nabopolasser brought Babylon into conflict with the Egyptians under Necho, Pharaoh of Egypt, who was trying to assert his claim to the country west of the Euphrates. The two armies met at Carchemish in 605 B. C. (Jer. 46-2), and Necho badly beaten, fled hastily, followed by Nebuchadrezzar and the conquering Chaldean army. With the defeat of Necho all the kings in S. W. Asia who had been vassals of Egypt pledged their allegiance to the Babylonian king. Among these was Jehoiakim king of Judah (2 Kings 24:1). The new kingdom of Babylon lasted until 538 B. C. when it was overrun by the Medes under Cyrus (For historical sketch see Goodspeed's "A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians" p. 324-6; also Paton's "The Early History of Syria and Palestine" pp. 271-275).

Our problem now is to settle as nearly as possible the particular time during this period in which the prophecy was written. As we have said before, Davidson, Driver and others take the view that it was written shortly after the battle of Carchemish, viz. about 600 B. C. They base their view on the selfishness and tyranny of Jehoiachim, on the one hand, and the effect of the Chaldean's victory at Carchemish, on the other. When one thinks of the picture of life in Judah described by the prophet in 1:2-4 he

Taking it for granted that it was written during the Chaldean period, it must have been written between 625 B. C. and 538 B. C. In 625 B. C. Nabopolassar, a man of energy and enterprise, had become ruler of Babylon. At first he was vicegerent under the suzerainty of Assyria. In 611 or 612 he declared his independence. In 607 Nineveh was laid in ruins by Nabopolassar, assisted by the Umman-Manda (one of the tribes of the North, probably the Medes). The victory of Nabopolassar brought Babylon into conflict with the Egyptians under Necho, Pharaoh of Egypt, who was trying to assert his claim to the country west of the Euphrates. The two armies met at Carchemish in 605 B. C. (Jer. 46:2), and Necho badly beaten, fled hastily, followed by Nebuchadrezzar and the conquering Chaldean army. With the defeat of Necho all the kings in S. W. Asia who had been vassals of Egypt pledged their allegiance to the Babylonian king. Among these was Jehoiakim king of Judah (2 Kings 24:1). The new kingdom of Babylon lasted until 538 B. C. when it was overrun by the Medes under Cyrus (for historical sketch see Goodspeed's "A History of the Babylonians and Assyrians" p. 324-8; also Paton's "The Early History of Syria and Palestine" pp. 271-279).

Our problem now is to settle as nearly as possible the particular time during this period in which the prophecy was written. As we have said before, Davidson, Driver and others take the view that it was written shortly after the battle of Carchemish, viz. about 600 B. C. They base their view on the selfishness and tyranny of Jehoiakim, on the one hand, and the defeat of the Chaldean's victory at Carchemish, on the other. When one thinks of the picture of life in Judah described by the prophet in 1:3-4 he

is led to believe that this date is the most fitting one for the coming of the Chaldeans. They have just won a brilliant victory over the Egyptians, and all the states in Palestine must look to them as their deliverers. But another problem presents itself. 1:5-11 presupposes a knowledge of the Chaldean methods of war and their rapacious character that would hardly be known to any Hebrew writer as early as 600 B. C., if indeed these qualities and methods of warfare had as yet been developed among the Chaldeans. Then there was the additional problem their successes raised in the prophet's mind (ch. 1:12ff). Carchemish and its outcome must have seemed to every pious Jew, who remembered Megiddo and the death of the pious king Josiah, a great deliverance. It was the Egyptians who had slain their valiant king and any nation that could beat such an enemy ought, and would have their eternal gratitude unless that nation's later treatment of them made this utterly impossible. In that case the Chaldeans would be regarded as raised for deliverance, and the "wicked" described in 1:12-17 would be Egypt. But the fact that Egypt is nowhere mentioned, and the further fact that Egypt had no such military equipment and power in this period as the prophet here describes, argues against the view that Egypt is the foe spoken of in 1:12-17. If Egypt is not the foe, it follows that the Chaldeans, who are evidently the foe, would have to be known better than it was possible to know them immediately after Carchemish.

When had the prophet had a chance to know that the Chaldeans dealt treacherously or "took up men as the fishes of the sea"? He and his countrymen must have had first hand experience with these "wicked ones". They must have felt the "mailed fist" of the

is led to believe that this date is the most fitting one for the coming of the Chaldeans. They have just won a brilliant victory over the Egyptians, and all the states in Palestine must look to them as their deliverers. But another problem presents itself. I:5-11 presupposes a knowledge of the Chaldean methods of war and their repulsive character that would already be known to any Hebrew writer as early as 600 B. C., if indeed these qualities and methods of warfare had as yet been developed among the Chaldeans. Then there was the additional problem their successes raised in the prophet's mind (ch. I:13ff). Conviction and its outcome must have seemed to every pious Jew, who remembered Megiddo and the death of the pious King Josiah, a great deliverance. It was the Egyptians who had slain their valiant King and any nation that could beat such an enemy ought, and would have their eternal gratitude unless that nation's later treatment of them made this utterly impossible. In that case the Chaldeans would be regarded as raised for deliverance, and the "wicked" described in I:13-17 would be Egypt. But the fact that Egypt is nowhere mentioned, and the further fact that Egypt had no such military equipment and power in this period as the prophet here describes, argues against the view that Egypt is the foe spoken of in I:13-17. If Egypt is not the foe, it follows that the Chaldeans, who are evidently the foe, would have to be known better than it was possible to know them immediately after Carchemish.

When had the prophet had a chance to know that the Chaldeans dealt treacherously or "took up men as the flakes of the sea"? He and his countrymen must have had first hand experience with these "wicked ones". They must have felt the "melted fist" of the

tyrant before he could write so bitterly concerning them.

In short what we seem to need for the date of our prophecy is one which, while it takes account of the conditions described in 1: 2-4, must also make due allowance for the changed attitude of the Hebrew toward the Chaldean avengers raised up by Yahweh; which changed attitude came from a fuller knowledge of their cruel character.

To the writer the key to the solution of the problem seems to be suggested by Kirkpatrick (Doctrine of the Prophets, p. 268), when he says: "The book as a whole is the fruit of religious reflection; it exhibits the communing and questioning of the prophet's soul with God, doubtless spread over considerable time, and presents conclusions reached only after a prolonged mental struggle."

When, during the Chaldean period, do we have such a situation as is described in 1:2-4? To the writer it would seem that the period between 597 and 586 B.C. more nearly fits the situation described in 1:2-4 than any other period in Israel's history. Speaking of the first deportation of the Jews to Babylon and its effect in the homeland, Kittel (History of the Hebrew, Eng. Trans., vol. 2, p. 392) says, "The deportation of the propertied and influential element was a source of many complications for the new constitution. Now that all offices and possessions were free, the door was open for the incapable, the ambitious and self-seeking. The new possessors of property and power, with the usual zeal of upstarts, were still less inclined than their predecessors had been to renounce the right of Judah to play an independent role,..... factions of all kind are formed; there seems even to have been instances of violence and bloodshed."

tyrant before he could write so bitterly concerning them.

In short what we seem to need for the date of our prophecy is one which, while it takes account of the conditions described in 1:2-4, must also make due allowance for the changed attitude of the Hebrew toward the Chaldean avengers raised up by Yahweh; which changed attitude came from a fuller knowledge of their cruel character.

To the writer the key to the solution of the problem seems to be suggested by Kirkpatrick (Doctrine of the Prophets, p. 283), when he says: "The book as a whole is the fruit of religious reflection; it exhibits the communing and questioning of the prophet's soul with God, doubtless spread over considerable time, and presents conclusions reached only after a prolonged mental struggle."

When, during the Chaldean period, do we have such a situation as is described in 1:2-4? To the writer it would seem that the period between 597 and 586 B.C. more nearly fills the situation described in 1:2-4 than any other period in Israel's history. Speaking of the first deportation of the Jews to Babylon and its effect in the homeland, Kittel (History of the Hebrew, Eng. Trans., vol. 3, p. 392) says, "The deportation of the properttied and influential element was a source of many complications for the new constitution. Now that all offices and possessions were free, the door was open for the incapable, the ambitious and self-seeking. The new possessors of property and power, with the usual zeal of upstarts, were still less inclined than their predecessors had been to renounce the right of Judah to play an independent role,.....
Factions of all kind are formed; there seems even to have been instances of violence and bloodshed."

Then, note the testimony of Ezekiel, the first prophet of the exile. It is a matter of common knowledge that he was among the captives taken to Babylon in that first deportation in 597. He began his work as a prophet in 592 B. C., and from that time until the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C., his prophecies had to do with conditions in Judah, and the approaching doom of the nation.

Note the strong words of the prophet in ch. 7:23-27; "Make the chain; for the land is full of bloody crimes, and the city is full of violence. Wherefore I will bring the worst of the nations, and they shall possess their houses: I will also make the pride of the strong to cease; and their holy places shall be profaned. Destruction cometh; and they shall seek peace and there shall be none. Mischief shall come upon mischief, and rumor shall be upon rumor; and they shall seek a vision of the prophet; but the law shall perish from the priest, and counsel from the elders. The king shall mourn, and the prince shall be clothed with desolation, and the hands of the people of the land shall be troubled: I will do unto them after their way and according to their deserts will I judge them; and they shall know that I am Jehovah."

Again, note the prophet's words in ch. 8:17-18, "Is it a light thing to the house of Judah that they commit the abominations which they commit here? for they have filled the land with violence, and have turned again to provoke me to anger..... Therefore will I also deal in wrath; mine eyes shall not spare, neither will I have pity; and though they cry in mine ears with a loud voice, yet will I not hear them."

Compare Yahweh's statement, that though they cry with a loud voice he will not hear them, with Habakkuk's complaint in

1:2-4 that although he had cried out of violence etc. Yahweh had not hearkened.

Other quotations might be given but those already given seem sufficient to substantiate our view that the situation described in Habakkuk 1:2-4 is similar to, and we believe, contemporaneous with the situation and period described above by the prophet Ezekiel, and that the conditions described by both were prevalent during the period between 597 B. C. and 586 B. C.

Further, this view gives the longer time necessary for a Hebrew prophet to get that fuller knowledge of the Chaldean character which our author reveals in 1:5-11. He has seen the Chaldean at close range. His nation has come to battle with him. They have relt the weight of the "mailed fist", of the rapacious conqueror.

One occasion for this fuller knowledge of the methods and barbarities of their conqueror would seem to be furnished in the treatment accorded Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim, and his captured subjects, at the time of the first deportation in 597 B. C. Note the account as given in 2 Kings 24:10-17: "at that time the servants of Nebuchadnezzar king of Babylon came unto the city while his servants were besieging it; and Jehoiachin the king of Judah went out to the king of Babylon, he and his mother and his servants, and his princes, and his officers, and the king of Babylon took him in the eighth year of his reign. And he carried out thence all the treasures of the house of Jehovah, and the treasures of the king's house, and cut in pieces all the vessels of gold which Solomon king of Israel had made in the temple of Jehovah.....And He carried away Jehoiachin to Babylon,

and the king's mother, and the king's wives, and his officers, and the chief men of the land, carried he into captivity from Jerusalem to Babylon etc."

Here is the treachery about which the prophet Habakkuk speaks in 1:13. The rebellion was begun by Jehoiakim who doubtless all along had retained his Egyptian sympathies. His son Jehoiachin goes out on the approach of the king and gives himself up, expecting, as he had a right to, some measure of clemency for himself and loved ones. Instead, he and his family and thousands of his subjects are deported from their native land.

But while this act of treachery gave the Hebrews a fuller insight into the character of the Chaldeans and led them to understand that their conquerors meant to put down revolts with a firm hand, not even it alone was calculated to produce such intense bitterness in the heart of the most patriotic Hebrew as is shown in the words of Habakkuk in 1:12-17. This cruel nation has "Swallowed up" nations more righteous than itself; has made men as the fishes of the sea; has taken them up with its angle, and gathered them in its drag. The prophet and his people must have had a yet more bitter experience with him than even the deportation of Jehoiachin and those associated with him.

The occasion for the intense bitterness of the prophet would seem to be furnished in the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. Kittel (Hist. of the Hebrews, vol. 2, Eng. Trans. pp. 393-394) describes the capture and destruction of Jerusalem as follows: "The besiegers have returned. Famine rages in the city. After besieging it for a year and a half, Nebuchadrez-

zar's troops succeed in making a breach in the walls. Zedekiah (the king) is seized with the courage of despair. He attempts a sortie. On the south side he succeeds in breaking through the ranks of the besiegers. He has already gained the open, and tries to flee to the country east of the Jordan. He is overtaken at Jericho and made prisoner, and his troops are dispersed. He is blinded by Nebuchadrezzar and carried off in chains to Babylon. His sons were executed before his very eyes. The city is given up for a month to the plundering troops of the enemy, and then set fire to, together with the temple and the king's fortress. The walls fall; what still remained of the temple utensils is carried off. A frightful doom overtakes those who are found alive in the city. The populace is subjected to a second deportation," This vivid account is borne out by 2 Kings 25:1-21.

Here, in the mind of the writer, is to be found the reason for the intense bitterness evident on the part of the prophet for the wicked one "Whose might is his god". Let us make some comparisons between the two passages. "They gather captives as the sands." He has before him not only the thousands of his own countrymen who were carried away to Babylon in the two deportations, but the proportionately equal number that were being taken at this time from the neighboring states of Edom, Moab, Ammon etc. "He scoffeth at kings". The contempt for and harsh treatment accorded both Jehoiachin and Zedekiah. "He divideth every stronghold; for he heapeth up dust, and taketh it." His army besieged Jerusalem on two different occasions: the result of the of the siege the first time was the surrender of Jehoiachin; a

year and a half the second time, ended in the city's complete destruction. His army besieged Tyre for thirteen years, beginning probably in 598 B. C. (Paton's the Early History of Syria and Palestine p. 279--However, the ordinary view is that the siege was 585-573 B. C.).

The date of the prophecy then, in the opinion of the writer, is to be found in that period immediately following the fall and destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B. C., probably 585 B. C. It was written while the thoughts of the whole people were fixed on the national tragedy. Habakkuk then was a contemporary of Ezekiel.

But immediately another problem presents itself. How can this date square with the statement in 1:6 touching the raising up of the Chaldeans? How is it possible to have prediction on the part of a prophet, after the event, and still call it prophecy?

Cornill (Prophets of Israel, Eng. Trans. p. 127) would call this "applied prophecy", the type of prophetic exposition of the history of Israel, which converts the historian into a prophet with his eyes turned toward the past.

But as a matter of fact, according to our view, Habakkuk's work as a prophet did not consist in predicting the raising up of the Chaldeans. That had been done in a far more vivid way by others. He was raised up to predict the downfall of the Chaldeans, to bring comfort to the depressed and burdened hearts of his almost despairing countrymen in Judah, as Ezekiel, after the fall of Jerusalem, did in Babylon.

It might not be amiss to emphasize in this connection a fact as to the nature of prophecy, which is not always clearly

understood. "The idea of prediction was a subordinate one in the Hebrew conception of God. According to the O. T., the prophet was primarily and essentially a speaker for God. It was his function to declare to men the divine will and purpose" (Knudson, Beacon Lights of Prophecy, p. 30).

Surely there was need here of declaring the "divine will and purpose" to these people who had almost lost their faith because of the terrible experiences through which they had passed, and so Yahweh raised up a man whose sole business it was to declare that will and purpose. The matter of the Chaldeans being raised up, as well as the mention and description of the wretched conditions which prevailed in Judah prior to the Chaldean invasion, were only given as parts of the link in the prophet's statement of the whole circumstances about which he was raised up to write. He briefly and yet vividly brings before his people the sad picture with which they had been confronted for years, and which reached its climax in the fall and destruction of Jerusalem. But he does not stop with that picture of sadness. He has been "down in the valley" with them. He knows the terrible burden of sorrow and darkness under which they are staggering. He has been there, too. But now he has come out into the light, and so comes to give his countrymen the benefit of his vision.

As further proof of our view that Habakkuk was a contemporary of Ezekiel and wrote after the fall of Jerusalem, note the fact (1) that unlike all the pre-exilic prophets, even Jeremiah and Ezekiel (until after the fall of Jerusalem), he does not emphasize the doom that was coming to them. (2) He essays to comfort Israel. That was clearly the role of Ezekiel after

586 B. C. (3) He used a figure common to Ezekiel in this period, in speaking of his work. Ezekiel spoke of himself as a "watchman over the house of Israel" (Ch. 3:16): Habakkuk in seeking light on the problem of Israel's suffering, said, "I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will look forth to see what he will speak to me, and what I shall answer concerning my complaint" (Ch. 2:1). The two prophets were filling the same role with their people.

Again, the fact that we have here a problem study, due to the fact that a prophet dared to ask Yahweh himself the "why" of certain conditions, suggests that it must have been later than the time of Jeremiah. The latter raises the problem of suffering (Ch. 12:1-6), but, in the first place it only concerned his individual suffering, and in the second place he drops it as being too difficult for him to solve. But not even he, pretended to question the justice of Yahweh's dealings with Israel as a nation. And while his failure is not proof conclusive that he antedated Habakkuk, who did raise this question; still when one remembers that these "problem studies" and "speculations" which later played so large a part in the literature of the Hebrews, were all much later, it strongly suggests that our prophecy, strongly speculative as it is, must have been written later than Jeremiah.

And finally the question raised by the prophecy would seem to become most pertinent in a great national crisis such as the fall of Jerusalem in 586 would bring.

For these reasons we give it as our conviction that the prophecy of Habakkuk (Chs. 1 and 2) was written in the years immediately following the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C.

In line with the view expressed above, the interpretation of the Book of Habakkuk would be as follows:

The book is of composite authorship. The first two chapters, except possibly a few interpolations in 2:9-20, were written by the author whose name the book bears. Chapter 3 is a Psalm taken from one of the Temple Collections for praise and worship. It was added to our prophecy, in all probability, by some devout Levite, who after reading the prophecy and sensing clearly its message of comfort and hope, felt that this stirring patriotic hymn would be a fitting close to the prophet's message, and so added it to the prophecy.

The first two chapters were the result of the prophet's long pondering over the continued calamities to his nation which ended in the capture and destruction of Jerusalem.

He was first filled with concern over the unhappy political and social conditions which obtained among his own countrymen, the Jews. He felt that these conditions could not go on forever and so regarded the coming of the Chaldeans as an act of vengeance on the part of Yahweh for the sins of Judah. But as he learns more of the Chaldean character, and notes how cruel and vindictive they are--a characteristic made clear by their utter destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B. C.-- he thinks Yahweh has made a mistake as to the character of his instrument of justice. The Chaldeans are more wicked than those whose sins they punish.

The whole situation is a problem to the prophet and his people. He finally solves it by telling his people that the Chaldeans would not go on dominating continually and forever. The root of their destruction was in themselves. Only the

righteous could live; and they only because of their faith.

The Book was written to comfort the crushed and broken-hearted Judahites, whose national capital had just been captured and destroyed. He wanted to let them know that there was something yet for which to live.

III. TRANSLATION, BASED ON METRICAL ARRANGEMENT OF HEBREW TEXT.

III. TRANSLATION, BASED ON METRICAL ARRANGEMENT OF HEBREW TEXT.

In the preceding section we have set forth, at some length, our own solution of the problems found in the book of Habakkuk, and have followed this with an interpretation of the book in the light of the proposed solution of these various problems. In this section we submit a translation of the book of Habakkuk, based on the metrical arrangement of the Hebrew Text. The translation is as follows:

SUPERSCRIPTION.

1. The Revelation[1] which Habakkuk the prophet saw.

I. The Dialogue Between Yahweh and the Prophet. 1:2-2:4.

The Prophet's complaint, vv. 2-4.

2. How long, O Yahweh, have I cried,
And thou dost not hearken?
I cry out to thee: violence,
And thou givest no aid.

3. Why dost thou cause me to see wickedness,
And (thou) dost look[2] with indifference upon mischief?
Oppression and violence are before me,
There is strife[3]; and contention ariseth.

4. Therefore the law is paralyzed,
And justice doth never obtain;
For the wicked encompass[4] the righteous,
Therefore justice goeth forth perverted.

1 - משא -- Noun from נשא "to lift". The noun means "a load", "burden", "lifting". When this lifting up is done by a prophet, it has the sense of "oracle" or "revalation".

In the preceding section we have set forth, at some length, our own solution of the problems found in the book of Habakkuk, and have followed this with an interpretation of the book in the light of the proposed solution of these various problems. In this section we submit a translation of the book of Habakkuk, based on the metrical arrangement of the Hebrew Text. The translation is as follows:

SUPERSCRIPTION.

1. The Revelation[1] which Habakkuk the prophet saw.

I. The Dialogue Between Yahweh and the Prophet. 1:2-2:4.

The Prophet's complaint, vv. 2-4.

2. How long, O Yahweh, have I cried,
And thou dost not hearken?
I cry out to thee: violence,
And thou givest no aid.

3. Why dost thou cause me to see wickedness,
And (thou) dost look[2] with indifference upon mischief?
Oppression and violence are before me,
There is strife[3]; and contention ariseth.
4. Therefore the law is paralyzed,
And justice doth never obtain;
For the wicked encompass[4] the righteous,
Therefore justice goeth forth perverted.

1 - נשׂא -- Noun from נשׂא "to lift". The noun means "a load", "burden", "lifting". When this lifting up is done by a prophet, it has the sense of "oracle" or "revelation".

2 - תַּבִּיטוּ (תֵּבִּיטוּ) -- Hiph. Imperf. from נָבַט (נָבֵט) to look upon, i. e., to endure, to see (to look upon with indifference). Kelly (The Strophic structure of Habakkuk in Amer. Journ. of Sem. Languages and Lit., Jan. 1902, p. 101) reads after the Targum and the Syr. version אַבִּיטוּ . He thinks this the better reading unless with Ewald we allow a causative force for תַּבִּיטוּ (תֵּבִּיטוּ) which does not seem to have that meaning elsewhere. However, we do not see the advantage to be gained by departing from the M. T. which the LXX and the Vulg. in reality retain.

3 - וְהַבִּיטוּ Some would omit as a gloss (Kelly). He thinks it was inserted to explain the unusual וְהָבֵּט יִשָּׂא.

4 - מַכְבִּיר Hiph. of כָּבַר to surround or encompass (an enemy). LXX has κατασυναστεύει "to oppress or have dominion over". Nowack suggests מַכְרִית . He thinks the term מַכְבִּיר too weak to express what the wicked one had done. The wicked had most likely annihilated ("Vernichtet") the righteous. Nowack would compare it with בָּלַע in v. 13. (Handkommentor zu A. T. p. 276, Notes, Ed. 1903).

2 - [illegible] -- Hiph. Imperf. from [illegible] to look upon, i. e., to endure, to see (to look upon with indifference). Kelly (The Strophic structure of Habakkuk in Amer. Journ. of Sem. Languages and Lit., Jan. 1902, p. 101) reads after the Targum and the Syr. version [illegible]. He thinks this better reading unless with Ewald we allow a causative force for [illegible] which does not seem to have that meaning elsewhere. However, we do not see the advantage to be gained by departing from the M. T. which the LXX and the Vulg. in reality retain.

3 - [illegible] Some would omit as a gloss (Kelly). He thinks it was inserted to explain the unusual [illegible].

4 - [illegible] Hiph. of [illegible] to surround or encompass (an enemy). LXX has [illegible] "to oppress or have dominion over". Nowack suggests [illegible]. He thinks the term [illegible] too weak to express what the wicked one had done. The wicked had most likely annihilated ("Vernichtet") the righteous. Nowack would compare it with [illegible] in v. 13. (Handkommentar zu A. T. p. 276, Notes, Ed. 1903).

The Chaldeans being raised up, vv. 5-6.

5. Look ye among the nations[1] and behold,
Tarry ye[2] and wonder;
For I am doing a work in your days,
Which ye would not believe if it were told you.

6. For behold I am raising up the Chaldeans,
A nation bitter and impetuous,
Who go through the breadths of the earth,
To possess dwelling-places not their own.

1 - בַּגּוֹיִם . Kelly, Ward, Nowack an d others, would read instead בּוֹגְדִים . The reasons for this rendering are (1) the presence of בּוֹגְדִים in a similar position with הַבְּגִידִים in 1:13; (2) The desire to establish a connection in the need for chastisement between the disorders in vv. 1:2-4 and the Chaldean invasion. To the writer the context would seem to suggest the M. T. rendering. With this Nicolardot, Stonehouse, G. A. Smith, Driver, Davidson and others agree.

2 - וְהִתְמַהּוּ תְּמָהוּ Stonehouse thinks the combination we have here is somewhat strange, and that the text is in error. He says the Hithpaʿel הִתְמַהּוּ occurs only here. In view of the fact that in Isa. 29:9 we have the phrase הִתְמַהְמְהוּ וּתְמָהוּ occurring as an expression of astonishment, he thinks it is possible that this was the original text. In that case it would read "tarry ye and wonder". To the writer this view and the reasons for it are convincing. Further, there are others which tend to strengthen it: we find the imperf. of the hithpalpel, יִתְמַהְמָהּ used in Habakkuk 2:3, as well as a number

The Chaldeans being raised up, vv. 5-6.

5. Look ye among the nations, and behold,
Tarry ye, and wonder;
For I am doing a work in your days,
Which ye would not believe if it were told you.

6. For behold I am raising up the Chaldeans,
A nation bitter and impetuous,
Who go through the breadths of the earth,
To possess dwelling-places not their own.

1 - [illegible] . Kelly, Ward, Now ack an d others, would read instead [illegible] . The reasons for this rendering are (1) the presence of a [illegible] in a similar position with [illegible] in I:13; (2) The desire to establish a connection in the need for chastisement between the disorders in vv. I:2-4 and the Chaldean invasion. To the writer the context would seem to suggest the M. T. rendering. With this Nicolardot, Stonehouse, G. A. Smith, Driver, Davidson and others agree.

2 - [illegible] Stonehouse thinks the combination we have here is somewhat strange, and that the text is in error. He says the Hithpa'el [illegible] occurs only here. In view of the fact that in Isa. 29:9 we have the phrase [illegible] occurring as an expression of astonishment, he thinks it is possible that this was the original text. In that case it would read "tarry ye and wonder". To the writer this view and the reasons for it are convincing. Further, there are others which tend to strengthen it: we find the imperf. of the hithpa'el, [illegible] used in Habakkuk 2:3, as well as a number

A detailed description of the Chaldeans, vv. 7-10.

7. Dreadful and terrible are they;
From themselves their justice and dignity proceed.

8. Swifter than leopards are their horses,
And more fierce than evening wolves;
And their horsemen[1] come from afar,
They fly as an eagle hastening to devour.

9. They come all of them for violence,
They set their faces[2] forward,
And they gather captives as the sand.

10. He scoffs at Kings,
And princes are an object of derision to him;
He laughs at every fortress,
And heaps up dust[3] and takes it.

of other places. Again the parallelism seems to require some such phrase as this emendation would give.

1 - In the line above of the M. T., the text is manifestly corrupt. There we have a third clause פָּשׁוּ פָּרָשָׁיו , instead of two clauses as we find in the line preceding it. The fact that one of these words is פָּרָשָׁיו , the first word we have in the following line, is suspicious. Then when we note that the LXX does not have this first פָּרָשָׁיו our suspicions appear to be confirmed. Nor does the word פָּשׁוּ seem to add to the clarity of the sentence. So it would seem better to drop both words. In this view Nowack, Peiser, Marti, Wellhausen, Nicolardot, and others agree.

A detailed description of the Chaldeans, vv. 7-10.

7. Dreadful and terrible are they;
From themselves their justice and dignity proceed.

8. Swifter than leopards are their horses,
And more fierce than evening wolves;
And their horsemen come from afar,
They fly as an eagle hastening to devour.

9. They come all of them for violence,
They set their faces forward,
And they gather captives as the sand.

10. He scoffs at Kings,
And princes are an object of derision to him;
He laughs at every fortress,
And heaps up dust and takes it.

of other places. Again the parallelism seems to require some such phrase as this emendation would give.

1 - In the line above of the M. T., the text is manifestly corrupt. There we have a third clause instead of two clauses as we find in the line preceding it. The fact that one of these words is , the first word we have in the following line, is suspicious. Then when we note that the LXX does not have this first our suspicions appear to be confirmed. Nor does the word seem to add to the clarity of the sentence. So it would seem better to drop both words. In this view Nowack, Peiser, Marti, Wellhausen, Nicolardot, and others agree.

2 - קָדִים פְּנֵיהֶם A difficult passage. קָדִים is only found here. Gesenius takes it from the root קָדַם "the host (of their faces). G. A. Smith, thinks it probably means "direction". Hitzig (according to G. A. Smith, Twelve Prophets, p. 135, n.3) translates it "desire", "striving". Delitzsch (Keil and Delitzsch Com. on Hab.) thinks it means "snorting", "endeavoring", from the root נָפַח . Duhm translates it "from Gomer" and thinks it probably one of the cities of Ionia-Cappodocia. His translation is "From Gomer they marched toward the East." Stonehouse thinks the text is in some disorder as the clause seems intended to give some further information as to what the Chaldean does, rather than a description of what he is.

To the writer it seems that this word קָדִים is a hopeless corruption. If it comes, as most scholars think, from the root קָדַם "to assemble" or "an assemblage", we cannot make sense of the clause. Further, the context would suggest that we have here more information about what the Chaldeans do. The second word פְּנֵיהֶם gives us a clue. Wherever this word is used in a hostile sense, as is apparently the case here, the words employed are שִׂים and נָתַן . For example in Lev. 20:3, we have אֶתֵּן אֶת־פָּנַי (also note Ezek. 15:7; Jer. 21:10; Lev. 17:10 etc). This would suggest here the emendation יִתֵּן פְּנֵיהֶם (in agreement with the sing. imperf. יִבֹּא) instead of the M. T. This seems to be borne out by one of the meanings of קָדִים , which is "forward" in a hostile sense. It is used with this sense in 2 Kings 19:32 and Isa. 37:33. The LXX agrees with this in the rendering ἀνθεστηκότας προσώποις αὐτῶν ἐξεναντίας . Our rendering then would be, "They set their faces forward", in a hostile sense.

2 - בְּנֵי מֵעַל A difficult passage. מֵעַל is only found here. Gesenius takes it from the root עלל "the host (of their faces). G. A. Smith, thinks it probably means "direction". Hitzig (according to G. A. Smith, Twelve Prophets, p. 155, n.3) translates it "desire", "striving". Delitzsch (Keil and Delitzsch Com. on Hab.) thinks it means "snorting", "endeavoring", from the root עלל. Dunn translates it "From Gomer" and thinks it probably one of the cities of Ionia-Cappodocia. His translation is "From Gomer they marched toward the East." Stonehouse thinks the text is in some disorder as the clause seems intended to give some further information as to what the Chaldean does, rather than a description of what he is.

To the writer it seems that this word מַעַל is a hopeless corruption. If it comes, as most scholars think, from the root עלל"to assemble" or "an assemblage", we cannot make sense of the clause. Further, the context would suggest that we have here more information about what the Chaldeans do. The second word עֲלֵי gives us a clue. Wherever this word is used in a hostile sense, as is apparently the case here, the words employed are נגד and שׂים. For example in Lev. 20:3, we have שׂים פנים (also note Ezek. 15:7; Jer. 21:10; Lev. 17:10 etc). This would suggest the emendation עֲלֵי שִׂימוּ (In agreement with the sing. impert. שִׂימוּ) instead of the M. T. This seems to be borne out by one of the meanings of נָשָׂא, which is "forward" in a hostile sense. It is used with this sense in 2 Kings 19:32 and Isa. 37:33. The LXX agrees with this in the rendering ἐνθεσπιχόται κροσώπους αὐτῶν ἔξενανται. Our rendering then would be, "They set their faces forward", in a hostile sense.

The Chaldeans' attitude changes, v. 11.

11. Then his attitude[1] changes,
And he passes over and becomes an offender[2]:
This, his strength, is his god.

3 - וַיֶּעְבֹּר The technical expression is "to throw up a mound", compare 2 Kings 19:32; Jer. 6:6.

1 - רוּחַ -- Several readings are suggested, but we prefer the M. T. here, which seems to be supported by the LXX (τότε μεταβαλεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα). It is also in line with our general position, that at first the prophet thought of the Chaldean as a deliverer, but, after a number of victories, the Chaldean's attitude changed, and he made his strength his god.

2 - וְאָשֵׁם -- Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti suggest that this word points to some form of שִׂים , and would make this form וַיָּשֶׂם connecting it with the following clause. Nowack thinks the construction which places וְאָשֵׁם as the last member of the verse is not only too unwieldy, but makes the conclusion of the whole portrayal too weak. Stonehouse, replying to this suggestion, says, it seems to be attractive, but in the present case וְאָשֵׁם seems to complete the description of the preceding term and the וְ begins a new clause. With this view we agree.

The Chaldeans' attitude changes, v. 11.

11. Then his attitude changes,

And he passes over and becomes an offender:

This, his strength, is his god.

3 - The technical expression is "to throw up a mound", compare 2 Kings 19:32; Jer. 6:6.

1 - -- Several readings are suggested, but we prefer the M. T. here, which seems to be supported by the LXX ( ). It is also in line with our general position, that at first the prophet thought of the Chaldean as a deliverer, but, after a number of victories, the Chaldean's attitude changed, and he made his strength his god.

2 - -- Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti suggest that this word points to some form of , and would make this form connecting it with the following clause. Nowack thinks the construction which places as the last member of the verse is not only too unwieldy, but makes the conclusion of the whole portrayal too weak. Stonehouse, replying to this suggestion, says, it seems to be attractive, but in the present case seems to complete the description of the preceding term and the begins a new clause. With this view we agree.

The Prophet in a Quandary 1:12-17.

His Confidence in Yahweh, v. 12.

12. Art not thou from time immemorial, O Yahweh,
My holy God, Thou undying One[1]?
O Yahweh, for justice thou hast raised him up;
O Rock, for reproof thou hast established him.

1 - לֹא נָמוּת --According to some Jewish traditions this is one of the eighteen passages called Tikkune Sopherim ("Corrections of the Scribes"). These are passages in which the original reading was supposed to have been altered by scribes on account of its containing something which appeared to them to be unseemly or irreverent. Here the original reading is supposed to have been, "Thou wilt not die", changed to "We shall not die". This change is supposed to have been made because of the irreverence implied in bringing together the ideas of God and death. However, the LXX has this same reading. To the writer it seems that we have here an instance of the Niphcal participle being confused with the 1st person, plu. imperf. of the Kal. The consonants would be the same in both cases. It is only when they are pointed with the vowels that the difference is seen. For example נָמוּת "we shall die"; נָמוּת (when used with the pronoun) "Thou thyself who diest". The context would seem to suggest the latter reading. Following out the custom of the ancients in addressing the Deity, the author is applying many honorary epithets to him. Yahweh is from ancient times, a Holy One, a Rock etc. In harmony with the use of these epithets is the use of a term which expresses the immortality of the Deity. Otherwise we would seem to have here a gloss.

The Prophet in a Quandary I:12-17.

His Confidence in Yahweh, v. 12.

12. Art not thou from time immemorial, O Yahweh,
My holy God, Thou undying One?
O Yahweh, for justice thou hast raised him up;
O Rock, for reproof thou hast established him.

1 - Hab1 82 --According to some Jewish traditions this is one of the eighteen passages called Tikkune Sopherim ("Corrections of the Scribes"). These are passages in which the original reading was supposed to have been altered by scribes on account of its containing something which appeared to them to be unseemly or irreverent. Here the original reading is supposed to have been, "Thou wilt not die", changed to "We shall not die". This change is supposed to have been made because of the irreverence implied in bringing together the ideas of God and death. However, the LXX has this same reading. To the writer it seems that we have here an instance of the Niphcal participle being confused with the 1st person, plu. imperf. of the Kal. The consonants would be the same in both cases. It is only when they are pointed with the vowels that the difference is seen. For example hib1 "we shall die"; hib1 (when used with the pronoun) "Thou thyself who diest". The context would seem to suggest the latter reading. Following out the custom of the ancients in addressing the Deity, the author is applying many honorary epithets to him. Yahweh is from ancient times, a Holy One, a Rock etc. In harmony with the use of these epithets is the use of a term which expresses the immortality of the Deity. Otherwise we would seem to have here a gloss.

The Prophet's Difficulty, vv. 13-14.

13. Thou whose eyes are too pure to behold evil;
Who art not able to look upon mischief;
Why dost thou look upon those who deal treacherously[1];
Art silent when the wicked swallow up those more (righteous than they?

14. And thou dost make men as the fishes of the sea,
As creeping things that have no ruler over them.

1 - בּוֹגְדִים --Kal Participle Plu. of בָּגַד "to deal treacherously". The participle means, "Those dealing treacherously". This evidently refers to the Chaldeans from their rapacious conduct. Compare Isa. 21:2 where Babylon is referred to as "the treacherous man who dealeth tracherously, and the destroyer who destroyeth". For proof that Isaiah refers to Babylon see v. 9 of chapter 21. The expression seems to have been used with reference to Israel's enemies (cf. Isa. 24:16).

The Prophet's Difficulty, vv. 13-14.

13. Thou whose eyes are too pure to behold evil;
Who art not able to look upon mischief;
Why dost thou look upon those who deal treacherously;
Art silent when the wicked swallow up those more
(righteous than they?

14. And thou dost make men as the fishes of the sea;
As creeping things that have no ruler over them.

1 - בגד bâgad --Kal Participle Plu. of בגד "to deal treacherously". The participle means, "Those dealing treacherously". This evidently refers to the Chaldeans from their rapacious conduct. Compare Isa. 21:2 where Babylon is referred to as "the treacherous man who dealeth treacherously, and the destroyer who destroyeth". For proof that Isaiah refers to Babylon see v. 9 of chapter 21. The expression seems to have been used with reference to Israel's enemies (cf. Isa. 24:16).

The Chaldean's Atrocities Narrated vv. 15-16.

15. All of them they take up with the hook;
And drag away in their net;
And gather together in their seine.
Therefore they rejoice and are glad.

16. Therefore they sacrifice to their net,
And burn incense to their seine;
For in them their portion is fat,
And their food plenteous.

The Prophet's Question, v. 17.

17. Will they therefore empty their net,
And continue to slay[1] the nations unsparingly[2]?

1 - יְהַרֹג An example of the socalled periphrastic future (cf. Ges.-K. 114 h-k).

2 - תָּמִיד אַל -- "Unsparingly" (cf. Ges.-K. 156 g).

The Chaldean's Atrocities Narrated vv. 15-16.

15. All of them they take up with the hook;
And drag away in their net;
And gather together in their seine.
Therefore they rejoice and are glad.

16. Therefore they sacrifice to their net,
And burn incense to their seine;
For in them their portion is fat,
And their food plenteous.

The Prophet's Question, v. 17.

17. Will they therefore empty their net,
And continue to slay the nations unsparingly?

1 - [illegible] An example of the so-called periphrastic future (cf. Ges.-K. 114 h-k).

2 - [illegible] -- "Unsparingly" (cf. Ges.-K. 100 g).

The Prophet Awaiting Yahweh's Answer, ch. 2:1.

1. Upon my watch-tower I will stand,
And upon the fortress I will station myself;
And I will look forth to see what he will speak with me,
And what he will reply[1] concerning my impeachment.

Yahweh's Answer, Ch. 2:2-4.

2. And Yahweh answered me and said:
Write the vision, and make it plain upon the tablets;[2]
In order that one may read it when running.

3. For yet is the vision for the appointed time;
It panteth[3] for the end and will not fail;
Though it tarry, wait thou for it;
For it will surely come, it will not delay.

4. Behold, swollen[4], not level, is their soul within them,
But the righteous shall live by his faith.[5]

1 - אָשִׁיב We prefer to read with Now., Mart., Driver, Hoonacker, Stonehouse and Ward the 3rd per. יָשִׁיב instead of the 1st per. of the M. T. The context seems to require the 3rd person instead of the 1st.

2 - לוּחוֹת -- "Tablets". Noun from לוּחַ . It was for writing prophecy on. Compare Isa. 30;8, also Isa. 8:1.

3 - וְיָפֵחַ --Hiph. 3rd per. Imperf., from פוּחַ , "to breathe, puff, pant". This form is the contracted form of יָפִיחַ (Compare Psa. 27:2).

4 - עֻפְּלָה --An adj. from עָפַל , to swell. G. A. Smith says it

The Prophet Awaiting Yahweh's Answer, ch. 2:1.

1. Upon my watch-tower I will stand,
And upon the fortress I will station myself;
And I will look forth to see what he will speak with me,
And what he will reply concerning my impeachment.

Yahweh's Answer, Ch. 2:2-4.

2. And Yahweh answered me and said:
Write the vision, and make it plain upon the tablets;[2]
In order that one may read it when running.

3. For yet is the vision for the appointed time;
It panteth[3] for the end and will not fail;
Though it tarry, wait thou for it;
For it will surely come, it will not delay.

4. Behold, swollen[4], not level, is their soul within them,
But the righteous shall live by his faith.[5]

1 - שָׁמַר We prefer to read with Now., Mart., Driver, Hoonacker, Stonehouse and Ward the 3rd per. יִשְׁמֹר instead of the 1st per. of the M. T. The context seems to require the 3rd person instead of the 1st.

2 - נִתַּן -- "Tablets". Noun from נָתַן . It was for writing prophecy on. Compare Isa. 30:8, also Isa. 8:1.

3 - נָפַח --Kiph. 3rd per. Imperf., from נָפַח , "to breathe, puff, pant". This form is the contracted form of נִפְעָל (Compare Psa. 27:2).

4 - עֻפְלָה --An adj. from עָפַל , to swell. G. A. Smith says it

is equivalent to the colloquial "swollen-head" as opposed to "level-headed" (G. A. Smith, The Twelve Prophets, p. 134, N. 4).

5 - בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ A number of authors such as Driver, Davidson, G. A. Smith, Duhm, Stonehouse and others render this term "his faithfulness". Delitzsch gives a number of meanings for the word: as an attribute of God, it means trustworthiness, unchangeable fidelity in the fulfilment of his promises (Deut. 22:4): as a personal attribute of man, fidelity in word and deed (Jer. 7:28; 9:2: Psa. 37:3); and in his relation to God, from attachment to God and undisturbed confidence in the divine promise of grace. This is the word used in speaking of Abraham's trust in God (Gen. 15:6).

It is evident from the context that our passage treats of the relation between man and God. It is the prophet's faith and trust in God that is in danger of being shaken. The danger is even greater among his people. As a reward for his faith he is promised "life". In addition אֱמוּנָה is opposed to the pride and conceit of the Chaldeans.

Jewish expositors have unanimously retained the meaning "faith": the LXX renders it πίστις , although by certain changes they have perverted the sense. The Apostle Paul (Rom. 1:17, Gal. 3:11) based his doctrine of "Justification by Faith" on this interpretation.

So the writer is of the opinion that the best rendering of this word, as far as the context and the traditional interpretation are concerned, is the one given in the American Revised Version: "The Righteous shall live by his faith." For a good representation of the other view, see Driver in Cent. Bible p. 63f.

is equivalent to the colloquial "swollen-head" as opposed to "level-headed" (G. A. Smith, The Twelve Prophets, p. 154, N. 4).

5 - אמונה A number of authors such as Driver, Davidson, G. A. Smith, Dahm, Stonehouse and others render this term "his faithfulness". Delitzsch gives a number of meanings for the word: as an attribute of God, it means trustworthiness, unchangeable fidelity in the fulfillment of his promises (Deut. 32:4): as a personal attribute of man, fidelity in word and deed (Jer. 7:28; 9:2: Psa. 37:3); and in his relation to God, from attachment to God and undisturbed confidence in the divine promise of grace. This is the word used in speaking of Abraham's trust in God (Gen. 15:6).

It is evident from the context that our passage treats of the relation between man and God. It is the prophet's faith and trust in God that is in danger of being shaken. The danger is even greater among his people. As a reward for his faith he is promised "life". In addition אמונה is opposed to the pride and conceit of the Chaldeans.

Jewish expositors have unanimously retained the meaning "faith": the LXX renders it πίστις, although by certain changes they have perverted the sense. The Apostle Paul (Rom. 1:17, Gal. 3:11) based his doctrine of "Justification by Faith" on this interpretation.

So the writer is of the opinion that the best rendering of this word, as far as the context and the traditional interpretation are concerned, is the one given in the American Revised Version: "The Righteous shall live by his faith." For a good representation of the other view, see Driver in Gent. Bible p. 831.

II The Woes, Ch. 2:5-20.

The Prophet's Comment, v. 5.

5. Moreover as wine[1] which deals treacherously,
The strong man is arrogant and is never contented[2]
But enlarges his soul as Sheol
And like death he is not satisfied.
He gathers to himself all the nations,
And heapeth to himself all the peoples.

1 - הַיַּיִן בִּי Here the text is manifestly corrupt. The LXX makes no mention of "wine". Most critics are agreed that emendations will have to be made. Wellhausen suggests that הַיַּיִן is a corruption of הוֹי with which this verse like 6b, 9, 12, 15, 19 may have originally begun. However, the impression we get from 6a is that the "taunt-songs" or "woes" begin in 6b. Driver would read הוֹי for הַיַּיִן and leave בִּי גַּאֲוָה as an unexplained residium. He would then render it, "ah! the treacherous dealer, the haughty man that resteth not."

According to the translation adopted above (by the present writer), there would be only a slight change in the text, and yet the clear and manifest idea contained in the context would be preserved. For הַיַּיִן בִּי we would read בְּיָיִן . This would parallel בְּשָׁאוֹל and בְּמָוֶת .

2 - יִנְוֶה Not found elsewhere in the O. T., and thought by our translators to mean "keepeth at home", because the noun allied to it (נָוֶה) means "homestead or resting-place". However, Driver says with reference to this use of the word: "If the text Hab. 2:5 be sound, Hebrew must have possessed a verb נוּה with

II The Woes, Ch. 2:6-20.

The Prophet's Comment, v. 5.

5. Moreover as wine, which deals treacherously,
The strong man is arrogant and is never contented;
But enlarges his soul as Sheol
And like death he is not satisfied.
He gathers to himself all the nations,
And heapeth to himself all the peoples.

1 - יין בגד Here the text is manifestly corrupt. The LXX makes no mention of "wine". Most critics are agreed that emendations will have to be made. Wellhausen suggests that יין בגד is a corruption of גיא with which this verse like 6b, 9, 12, 15, 19 may have originally begun. However, the impression we get from 6a is that the "taunt-songs" or "woes" begin in 6b. Driver would read גיא for יין בגד and leave 5 אף as an unexplained residium. He would then render it, "ah! the treacherous dealer, the haughty man that resteth not."

According to the translation adopted above (by the present writer), there would be only a slight change in the text, and yet the clear and manifest idea contained in the context would be preserved. For יין בגד we would read יגיא . This would parallel גיא and גבי .

2 - גבי: Not found elsewhere in the O. T., and thought by our translators to mean "keepeth at home", because the noun allied to it (גבי) means "homestead or resting-place". However, Driver says with reference to this use of the word: "If the text Heb. 2:5 be sound, Hebrew must have possessed a verb גבי with

some such sense as "to sit quiet", which does not appear in the cognate languages.

נָוָה may, perhaps, be connected with it. As a general thing נָוָה "habitation in general", but in particular it means a pastoral abode. It is only applied to other kinds of abode in poetry (Ex. 15:15) or the higher prose. Its use in the present connection is doubtful (Driver, Notes on Hebrew text of the Bks. of Samuel, p. 158). Wellhausen, Nowack, G. A. Smith and Marti would read instead יָרָוָה "to satisfy". In commenting on לְאֵיתָנוֹ Nowack says the word נוּחַ appears dubious. From what follows one would not expect here any allusion to his fate or fortune but a description of his activities. Besides, the verb נוּחַ is not found in Heb., nor any of its derivatives, with the meaning "to live". "To remain" from נוּחַ (dwelling, house) is very doubtful. Perhaps it is from יָרָוָה "be satisfied" which meets the demands of the following יִשְׂבַּע . This emendation seems to us the most satisfactory.

some such sense as "to sit quiet", which does not appear in the cognate languages.

נוה may perhaps be connected with it. As a general thing נוה "habitation in general", but in particular it means a pastoral abode. It is only applied to other kinds of abode in poetry (Ex. 15:13) or the higher prose. Its use in the present connection is doubtful (Driver, Notes on Hebrew text of the Bks. of Samuel, p. 158). Wellhausen, Nowack, G. A. Smith and Marti would read instead נוח "to satisfy". In commenting on נוה Nowack says the word נוה appears dubious. From what follows one would not expect here any allusion to his fate or fortune but a description of his activities. Besides, the verb נוה is not found in Heb., nor any of its derivatives, with the meaning "to live". "To remain" from נוה (dwelling, houses) is very doubtful. Perhaps it is from נוח "be satisfied" which meets the demands of the following נפשי . This emendation seems to us the most satisfactory.

A Prose Introduction to the Woes, v. 6a.

6a. Shall not all these lift up a taunt-song against them,
And songs of derision against them, and say[1]:

The First Woe, vv. 6b-8.

6b. Woe to him who multiplies that which is not his own[2] --
And loads himself with heavy pledges.

7. Shall not they suddenly rise up who shall bite[3] thee,
And they awake who shall violently shake thee,
And thou shall be for booty unto them?

8. Because thou hast plundered many nations,
All the rest of the peoples shall plunder thee;
Because of the blood of men and the violence done the earth,
The city, and all that dwell therein.

1 - וְיֹאמַר Probably וְיֹאמְרוּ with Nowack. Plu. to agree with יִשְׂאוּ and the clear sense of the passage.

2 - עַד־לֹא Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti think it a gloss. Nowack thinks it could hardly be used in any other sense than עַד־אָנָה in 1:2 and that would be very surprising here. Hence it must be a gloss.

3 - נֹשְׁכִים There is a play here on the double sense of the word נָשַׁךְ which means both "to bite" (Gen. 49:17) and also (Metaphorically) "to bite off" from the principal lent-to give interest. The participle means the giver of interest or the biter. The Chaldean is represented as the creditor who exacts heavy interest;

A Prose Introduction to the Woes, v. 6a.

6a. Shall not all these lift up a taunt-song against them,
And songs of derision against them, and say:

The First Woe, vv. 6b-8.

6b. Woe to him who multiplies that which is not his own --
And loads himself with heavy pledges.

7. Shall not they suddenly rise up who shall bite thee,
And they awake who shall violently shake thee,
And thou shall be for booty unto them?

8. Because thou hast plundered many nations,
All the rest of the peoples shall plunder thee;
Because of the blood of men and the violence done the earth,
The city, and all that dwell therein.

1 - Probably with Nowack. Plu. to agree with
and the clear sense of the passage.

2 - Well-known, Nowack, Marti think it a gloss. Nowack thinks it could hardly be used in any other sense than in I:2 and that would be very surprising here. Hence it must be a gloss.

3 - There is a play here on the double sense of the word which means both "to bite" (Gen. 49:17) and also (Metaphorically) "to bite off" from the principal lent-to give interest. The participle means the giver of interest or the biter. The Chaldean is represented as the creditor who exacts heavy interest;

The Second Woe, vv. 9-11.

9. Woe unto him who has made an evil gain to his house,
To set his nest on high,
To escape from the hand of evil.

10. Thou has devised shame to thy house,
Thou hast cut[1] off many peoples,
And hast forfeited[2] thine own life.

11. For a stone out of the wall shall cry out,
And the beam out of the timber shall answer it.

the nations are the debtors or biters who when their day comes will punish him remorselessly for his exactions (Driver Cent. B. p. 79 N).

1 - קְצוֹת Inf. Const. from קָצַץ . It might be used substantively; however, the LXX has συνεπέρανας which would suggest קָצוֹתָ , 2nd Mas. Perf.

2 - וְחוֹטֵא Literally "sinned against thy soul", but when the verb is used with the accusative, it means "forfeit one's life" (Brown, Driver, Briggs, Heb. lex. p. 307). Further, Duhm would change חוֹטֵא of M. T. to חָטָאתָ to make it agree with יָעַצְתָּ.

The Second Woe, vv. 9-11.

9. Woe unto him who has made an evil gain to his house,
To set his nest on high,
To escape from the hand of evil.

10. Thou has devised shame to thy house,
Thou hast cut off many peoples,
And hast forfeited thine own life.

11. For a stone out of the wall shall cry out,
And the beam out of the timber shall answer it.

the nations are the debtors or biters who when their day comes will punish him remorselessly for his exactions (Driver Cent. B. p. 79 N).

1 - מרע Inf. Const. from רעע . It might be used substantively; however, the LXX has συνεξέφανε which would suggest רעה 2nd Mas. Perf.

2 - מזמת Literally "sinned against thy soul", but when the verb is used with the accusative, it means "forfeit one's life" (Brown, Driver, Briggs, Heb. Lex. p. 307). Further, Dahm would change מזמת of M. T. to נפשו to make it agree with בצע.

The Third Woe, vv. 12-14.

12. Woe unto him who builds a city with blood,
And establishes[1] a town in unrighteousness.

13. Is it not from Yahweh of hosts,
That the people shall toil only for fire,[2]
And the tribes weary themselves for vanity?

14. For the earth shall be full
Of the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh,
As the waters cover the sea.

1 - וּבֹנֵה Perf. with waw consecutive continuing the partc. בֹּנֶה . It expresses a habit or custom: "And continually establishes a city" (cf. Ges. K 116 x).

2 - Here the prophet quotes a no doubt familiar proverb, (Jer. 51:58). "The peoples shall toil only for fire--for fire will destroy their cities." "The tribes weary themselves for vanity"--Their labor shall come to nought, for the empires they establish will fall into ruins.

The Third Woe, vv. 12-14.

12. Woe unto him who builds a city with blood,
And establishes[1] a town in unrighteousness.

13. Is it not from Yahweh of hosts,
That the peoples shall toil only for fire,[2]
And the tribes weary themselves for vanity?

14. For the earth shall be full
Of the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh,
As the waters cover the sea.

1 - [בָּנָה] Perf. with waw consecutive continuing the perfs. in v. 12. It expresses a habit or custom: "And continually establishes a city" (cf. Gen. K 11S x).

2 - Here the prophet quotes a no doubt familiar proverb, (Jer. 51:58). "The peoples shall toil only for fire--for fire will destroy their cities." "The tribes weary themselves for vanity"--Their labor shall come to nought, for the empires they establish will fall into ruins.

The Fourth Woe, vv. 15-17.

15. Woe unto him who giveth his neighbor drink
From the cup of his fury;[1]
And even maketh (his neighbor) drunk,
That he may gaze upon his nakedness.

16. Thou art filled with shame instead of glory:
Drink thou also and stagger.[2]
The cup of Yahweh's right hand shall be turned to thee,
And shame shall be for thy glory.

17. For the violence to Lebanon shall cover thee,
And the destruction of the beasts shall make thee (afraid;
Because of the blood of men, and the violence done (to the earth,
To the city, and all who dwell therein.

1 - וְסַפֵּתָּ חֲמָתֶךָ These words do not make sense. The verb occurs in the sense of "attach" or "join" in I Sam. 2:36; 26:19; Isa. 14:1. חֲמָתֶךָ comes from חֵמָה meaning "heat", hence figuratively it means "fury" (cf. Nahum 1:6). The expression as we have it in M. T., would read: "One who joins or adds to his fury", which is not very illuminating. Wellhausen emends the text on the basis of practically the same figure used in Zech. 12:2. Here we have the statement: הִנֵּה אָנֹכִי שָׂם אֶת־יְרוּשָׁלַם סַף־רַעַל "Behold I will make Jerusalem a cup of reeling etc."

Wellhausen by dropping the ת of the first word וְסַפֵּתָּ , which he thinks was attracted here because of the presence of the same

The Fourth Woe, vv. 15-17.

15. Woe unto him who giveth his neighbor drink
From the cup of his fury;[1]
And even maketh (his neighbor) drunk,
That he may gaze upon his nakedness.

16. Thou art filled with shame instead of glory:
Drink thou also and stagger.[2]
The cup of Yahweh's right hand shall be turned to thee,
And shame shall be for thy glory.

17. For the violence to Lebanon shall cover thee,
And the destruction of the beasts shall make thee
(afraid;
Because of the blood of men, and the violence done
(to the earth,
To the city, and all who dwell therein.

1 - חמת קדשו These words do not make sense. The verb occurs in the sense of "attach" or "join" in I Sam. 2:36; 26:19; Isa. 14:1. חמה comes from חם meaning "heat", hence figuratively it means "fury" (cf. Nahum 1:6). The expression as we have it in M. T., would read: "One who joins or adds to his fury", which is not very illuminating. Wellhausen amends the text on the basis of practically the same figure used in Zech. 12:2. Here we have the statement: הנני שם את ירושלם "Behold I will make Jerusalem a cup of reeling etc."

Wellhausen by dropping the ו of the first word חמת, which he thinks was attracted here because of the presence of the same

letter at the beginning of the next word, and by making another slight change, arrives at a clever rendering. His emendation is חֲמָתוֹ כּוֹס instead of what we have in M. T. This gives us, "From the cup of his fury".

2 - וְהֵעָרֵל Not found elsewhere but has been conjectured to mean "uncover the foreskin". Wellhausen emends the text by reading וְהֵרָעֵל instead (cf. Zech. 12:2; Isa. 51:17, 22), "and stagger".

letter at the beginning of the next word, and by making another slight change, arrives at a clever rendering. His emendation is [illegible] Instead of what we have in M. T. This gives us, "From the cup of his fury".

S - [illegible] Not found elsewhere but has been conjectured to mean "uncover the foreskin". Wellhausen emends the text by reading [illegible] instead (cf. Zech. 12:2; Isa. 51:17, 22), "and stagger".

The Fifth Woe, vv. 18-20.

18.[1] What does it profit the image that its maker hath
(formed it:
The molten-image and teacher of lies?
That he who fashioned his image trusted in it
To make dumb idols?

19. Woe to him that sayeth to the wood, awake!
To the dumb stones, arise!
2--Behold it is overlaid[3] with gold and silver
And there is no breath at all in it.

20. But Yahweh is in his holy temple,
Silence before him all the earth.

1 - A number of scholars would have v. 18 follow v. 19 (Nicolardot, Stonehouse, Rothstein) on the basis that the "woe" is mentioned in v. 19. See notes on reconstructed text, p. 168f

2 - V. 19 הוּא יָרֶה - Seems to be a gloss (Nowack, Bib. Heb.).

3 - מְצֻפֶּה Davidson (C. B. p. 82) says the term is obscure, though it may mean, "laid over with gold" or "set in gold".

The Fifth Woe, vv. 18-20.

18. What does it profit the image that its maker hath formed it:
That he who fashioned his image trusted in it
To make dumb idols?

19. Woe to him that sayeth to the wood, awake;
To the dumb stones, arise;
Behold it is overlaid with gold and silver--
And there is no breath at all in it.

20. But Yahweh is in his holy temple,
Silence before him all the earth.

1 - A number of scholars would have v. 18 follow v. 19 (Nicolardot, Stonehouse, Rothstein) on the basis that the "woe" is mentioned in v. 19. See notes on reconstructed text, p. [illegible].

2 - V. 19 מה־ועל - Seems to be a gloss (Nowack, Bib. Heb.).

3 - צפה Davidson (C. B. p. 82) says the term is obscure, though it may mean, "laid over with gold" or "set in gold".

III. The Psalm, Chapter 3.

Title, 3:1.

1. The Prayer[1] of Habakkuk the prophet set to Shigionoth[2].

The Prayer, v. 2.

2. O Yahweh I have heard thy fame;
O Yahweh I have feared thy work.
In the midst of the years revive it;
In the midst of the years make thyself known,[3]
In wrath remember mercy.

1 - תְּפִלָּה From פָּלַל . It means in general a prayer. It is the title of a number of psalms: 17:1, 86:1; 90:1; 102:1; and of the Davidic Psalter as a whole, 72:20.

2 - שִׁגְיֹנוֹת This is the plural of שִׁגָּיוֹן which appears in Psa. 7:1. The meaning, like most of the musical titles appearing in the Psalms, is obscure. The verb from which it comes is שָׁגָה , "to go astray" (Ezek. 34:6; Isa. 28:7 thru wine), hence it was supposed that Shiggayon may denote a dithyrambic poem, written in wandering, irregular rythms, and set to Shigyonoth, "One set to music of a similar character" (Dr. Cent. B. p. 86).

Others (Nowack, Wellhausen, Condamin, Marti, Briggs, Ward) follow the LXX and read שְׁגִיוֹנוֹת because this form is found in v. 19. Betteridge thinks the title in v. 19 was the beginning of a new Psalm, and was transcribed here by mistake. Duhm thinks we know too little of the musical indications in usage to declare the text unacceptable where they are concerned.

3 - תּוֹדִיעַ Nowack would follow the LXX and read instead תּוֹדַע ,

III. The Psalm, Chapter 3.

Title, 3:1.

1. The Prayer of Habakkuk the prophet set to Shigionoth.

The Prayer, v. 2.

2. O Yahweh I have heard thy fame;
O Yahweh I have feared thy work.
In the midst of the years revive it;
In the midst of the years make thyself known,
In wrath remember mercy.

1 - תְּפִלָּה From פָּלַל . It means in general a prayer. It is the title of a number of psalms: 17:1, 86:1; 90:1; 102:1; and of the Davidic Psalter as a whole, 72:20.

2 - שִׁגְיוֹנֹת This is the plural of שִׁגָּיוֹן which appears in Psa. 7: 1. The meaning, like most of the musical titles appearing in the Psalms, is obscure. The verb from which it comes is שָׁגָה , "to go astray" (Ezek. 34:6; Isa. 28:7 thru wine), hence it was supposed that Shiggayon may denote a dithyrambic poem, written in wandering, irregular rythms, and set to Shigyonoth, "One set to music of a similar character" (Dr. Cent. B. p. 86).

Others (Nowack, Wellhausen, Cordamin, Marti, Briggs, Ward) follow the LXX and read שִׁגְיוֹנוֹת because this form is found in v. 19. Betteridge thinks the title in v. 19 was the beginning of a new Psalm, and was transcribed here by mistake. Duhm thinks we know too little of the musical indications in usage to declare the text unacceptable where they are concerned.

3 - שִׁגְיוֹנֹת Nowack would follow the LXX and read instead שִׁיר ,

Yahweh's brilliant approach vv. 3-4.

3. God came from Teman,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran;
His majesty covered the heavens,
And the earth was full of his praise.

4. And his brightness was as the light,
And rays[1] of light went out from his hands,
And there was the hiding of his power.

Impf. Niph. after LXX γνωσθήσῃ . There seems to us, however, no necessity for a change from the M. T.

1 - קְרָנַיִם This from קֶרֶן originally "horns". Arabic poets called the first rays of light "horns", or rather compared them to "horns".

Yahweh's brilliant approach vv. 3-4.

3. God came from Teman,
And the Holy One from Mount Paran;
His majesty covered the heavens,
And the earth was full of his praise.

4. And his brightness was as the light,
And rays of light went out from his hands,
And there was the hiding of his power.

Impf. High. after LXX ... There seems to us, however, no necessity for a change from the M. T.

1 - 1375 This from 175 originally "horns". Arabic poets called the first rays of light "horns", or rather compared them to "horns".

Some Effects of Yahweh's Coming, vv. 5-6.

5. Before him went the pestilence,
And firebolts went out from his feet.

6. He stood and the earth melted[1];
He beheld and drove asunder the nations;
And the everlasting mountains were broken in pieces;
The eternal hills bowed themselves.
These be his ways from of old.[2]

1 - וַיְמַדֵּד The text here is evidently corrupt. מָדַד "measure", but the context would suggest a statement dealing with the effect of "his having stood". (cf. Am. 9:5; Mic. 1:3-4; Nah. 1:5). In these passages the effect of Yahweh's action is seen in the "melting of the earth". The verb used in Am. 9:5 and Nah. 1:5 is מוג . That we think is the emendation necessary here: וַיְמֹגֵּג for וַיְמַדֵּד (Nowack--Bib. Heb.; Driver--Cent. B. p. 89). Wellhausen is also inclined to וַיְמֹגֵּג which the LXX renders ἐσαλεύθη and which is the same word it renders for a form of מוג in Am. 9:5.

2 - The line הֲלִכוֹת עוֹלָם לוֹ .--Thus G. A. Smith (The Twelve Prophets, vol. 2, p. 153). He thinks the line so rendered sums up and clinches the theophany from v. 13 onward. He would not omit the line as Wellhausen does.

Some Effects of Yahweh's Coming, vv. 5-6.

5. Before him went the pestilence,
And firebolts went out from his feet.

6. He stood and the earth melted;
He beheld and drove asunder the nations;
And the everlasting mountains were broken in pieces;
The eternal hills bowed themselves.
Theirs be his ways from of old.[2]

1 - [illegible] The text here is evidently corrupt. [illegible] "measure", but the context would suggest a statement dealing with the effect of "his having stood". (cf. Am. 9:5; Mic. 1:3-4; Nah. 1:5). In these passages the effect of Yahweh's action is seen in the "melting of the earth". The verb used in Am. 9:5 and Nah. 1:5 is [illegible] . That we think is the emendation necessary here: [illegible] for [illegible] (Nowack--Bib. Heb.; Driver--Cent. B. p. 89). Wellhausen is also inclined to [illegible] which the LXX renders [illegible] and which is the same word it renders for a form of [illegible] in Am. 9:5.

2 - The line [illegible] .--Thus G. A. Smith (The Twelve Prophets, vol. 2, p. 153). He thinks the line so rendered sums up and climbes the theophany from v. 13 onward. He would not omit the line as Wellhausen does.

An Inquiry of Yahweh, vv. 7-8.

7. I have seen the tents of Cushan under violence,
The curtains of the land of Midian trembled.

8. O Yahweh, wast thine anger against the hills?[1]
Wast thy wrath against the rivers?
Wast thy outpouring against the sea?
That thou shouldst ride upon thy horses,
Upon the chariots of victory?

1 - הַבְּנְהָרִים A difficult passage. This word seems to be used in a tautologous way. It would seem that one of the words בְּנְהָרִים got into the text by an error. G. A. Smith would emend the text by reading for the present word, the word, הַבְּהָרִים , (is it with the hills), because hills have already been mentioned, and rivers occur in the next clause and are separated by the same disjunctive particle, אִם , which separates "the sea" in the third clause from them. The use of the second person suggests that יְהוָה is a vocative.

An Inquiry of Yahweh, vv. 7-8.

7. I have seen the tents of Cushan under violence,
The curtains of the land of Midian trembled.

8. O Yahweh, wast thine anger against the rivers,
Was thy wrath against the rivers?
Was thy outpouring against the sea?
That thou shouldst ride upon thy horses,
Upon the chariots of victory?

1 - בְּנָהָר A difficult passage. This word seems to be used in a tautologous way. It would seem that one of the words בְּנָהָר got into the text by an error. G. A. Smith would amend the text by reading for the present word, the word, בְּנָהָר, (is it with the Nilla), because Nilla have already been mentioned, and rivers occur in the next clause and are separated by the same disjunctive particle, בְּ, which separates "the sea" in the third clause from them. The use of the second person suggests that אִם is a vocative.

Yahweh in the Guise of a Warrier--Nature his first Victim, (vv. 9-11.

9. Thou hast surely brought into action thy bow;[1]
Thou didst fill thy quiver with missiles[2]
Thou didst cleave the earth into rivers.

10. The mountains saw thee, they withered in pain;[3]
The clouds poured forth waters;[4]
The deep gave forth its voice,
And lifted its hands on high.[5]

11. The sun and the moon stood still in their lofty abode,
At the light of thine arrows as they went forth;[6]
At the brightness of thy glittering spear.

1 - עֲרָיָה הֵעוֹר -- A very difficult passage. If the text is correct we have here a Niph. Imperf. of a supposed verb, עור . This verb does not occur elsewhere, according to Nowack. He is therefore suspicious of the present text. Further while it is possible to have a substantive (עֲרָיָה) used in the capacity of an infin. Absolute (Ges--K, 113 W), it is rarely done. We would ordinarily expect the infin. Abs. to be from the same root as the verb itself. It seems doubtful that we have such a verb as עור , therefore he (Gesenius-Kautzsch) accepts Wellhausen's emendation, based on 2 Sam. 23:18. He would substitute for the M. T., the phrase, עוֹרֵר הֵעוֹרֵר .

2 - שִׁבְעוֹת מַטּוֹת --No satisfactory rendering has been found for this clause by scholars. Undoubtedly the text is corrupt. Delitzsch (Dav. Camb. B. p. 88) calculates that a hundred transla-

Yahweh in the Guise of a Warrior--Nature His First Victim.
(vv. 9-11.

9. Thou hast surely brought into action thy bow;[1]
Thou didst fill thy quiver with missiles[2]
Thou didst cleave the earth into rivers.

10. The mountains saw thee, they withered in pain;[3]
The clouds poured forth waters;[4]
The deep gave forth its voice,
And lifted its hands on high.[5]

11. The sun and the moon stood still in their lofty abode,
At the light of thine arrows as they went forth;[6]
At the brightness of thy glittering spear.

1 - [illegible] -- A very difficult passage. If the text is correct we have here a Niph. Imperf. of a supposed verb, [illegible]. This verb does not occur elsewhere, according to Nowack. He is therefore suspicious of the present text. Further while it is possible to have a substantive ([illegible]) used in the capacity of an infin. Absolute (Ges--K, 113 W), it is rarely done. We would ordinarily expect the infin. Abs. to be from the same root as the verb itself. It seems doubtful that we have such a verb as [illegible], based on 2 Sam. 23:18. He would substitute for the M. T., the phrase, [illegible]

2 - [illegible] --No satisfactory rendering has been found for this clause by scholars. Undoubtedly the text is corrupt. Delitzsch (Dav. Comm. E. p. 88) calculates that a hundred transla-

tions of this passage have been offered. The word שְׁבֻעוֹת is rendered in the Authorized Version, "oaths"; it is the same in the R. V., except that on the margin there is the alternate reading, "Sworn were the chastisements of thy word." Both renderings are thoroughly unsatisfactory.

Two meanings have been given for מַטּוֹת "branches", "rods", "staffs", or "tribes". Delitzsch thinks it could not have meant "tribes", because in that case it would have been defined by a suffix or some determining clause. He renders it "stick" or "staff" for two reasons: it is suggested by the context--the allusion to the bow in the preceding clause--and the analogy in v. 14, where the word unquestionably means "staves" or "lances."

Perhaps the most satisfactory rendering of the clause is that proposed by Nowack. He sees in the Syriac rendering of this passage that it regards the M. T. שְׁבֻעוֹת as some form of שָׂבַע "be satisfied", and understood מַטּוֹת in the sense of "shafts", "arrows". This is supported by the rendering found in certain Greek Codices (23, 62, 86, 147, v. Field, Hexapla). On the basis of the clause ὁ προέβης ἐξηγέρθη τὸ τόξον σου,

ἐχόστασας βολίδας τῆς φαρέτρας αὐτῆς,

he conjectures that the original text read שָׂבַעְתָּ מַטּוֹת אֶשְׁפָּתֶךָ . He thinks the אֶשְׁפָּתֶךָ should replace אֹמֶר מֻלָּה and must have been the original reading. He explains the confusion of the two phrases as due to the similarity in form of all the letters of the old Semitic alphabet to each other. His rendering would then be read, "Thou didst fill thy quiver with missiles."

This rendering is not entirely convincing, especially as it relates to the alleged confusion of אֹהֶל סֶלָה with אַשְׁפְּתָה but it comes nearer solving a very difficult problem than any other that has come to the writer's attention.

3 - רָאוּךָ יָחִילוּ --Writhe in pain (cf. Psa. 77:17).

4 - זֶרֶם מַיִם עָבָר --Nowack, Marti, Wellhausen, Duhm, Nicolardot, Kelly (American Journ. Sem. Lang. p. 115) would emend the text on the basis of Psa. 77:18, which Psalm C. A. Briggs (Psalms Int. Crit. Com. vol. 2, p. 171 N) thinks was based on the Psalm in Hab. The emendation would be as follows: זָרְמוּ מַיִם עָבוֹת "The clouds poured forth waters". זָרְמוּ would be a poel denominative from זֶרֶם cf. שָׁרָה from שׁוֹרֵר -Ges.-K, 55 b).

5 - רוֹם יָדֵיהוּ נָשָׂא --A difficult passage, and a number of scholars (Nowack, Stonehouse, G. A. Smith etc.) regard it as corrupt. Various emendations of the text have been suggested, but none satisfactory in the judgment of the writer; therefore we prefer to leave the text as it is. This rendering, too, seems to fit the context. It certainly is preferable to transferring נָשָׂא to the following verse as Nowack and Stonehouse propose to do.

6 - חִצֶּיךָ יְהַלֵּכוּ Compare Psa. 77:18. Marti and Peiser regard "the sun and the moon" as the subject, but comparison with Psa. 77:18, which was evidently taken from Hab. 3, leads to the conclusion that "arrows" (חִצֶּיךָ) is the subject.

This rendering is not entirely convincing, especially as it relates to the alleged confusion of [illegible] with [illegible] but it comes nearer solving a very difficult problem than any other that has come to the writer's attention.

3 - [illegible] --Write in pain (cf. Pss. 77:17).

4 - [illegible] --Nowack, Marti, Wellhausen, Duhm, Nicolardot, Kelly (American Journ. Sem. Lang. p. 115) would emend the text on the basis of Pss. 77:18, which Psalm C. A. Briggs (Psalms Int. Crit. Com. vol. 2, p. 171 N) thinks was based on the Psalm in Hab. The emendation would be as follows: [illegible] "The clouds poured forth waters". [illegible] would be a poel denominative from [illegible] cf. [illegible] from [illegible] -Ges.-K, 85 b).

5 - [illegible] --A difficult passage, and a number of scholars (Nowack, Stonehouse, G. A. Smith etc.) regard it as corrupt. Various emendations of the text have been suggested, but none satisfactory in the judgment of the writer; therefore we prefer to leave the text as it is. This rendering, too, seems to fit the context. It certainly is preferable to transferring [illegible] to the following verse as Nowack and Stonehouse propose to do.

6 - [illegible] Compare Pss. 77:18. Marti and Peiser regard "the sun and the moon" as the subject, but comparison with Pss. 77:18, which was evidently taken from Hab. 3, leads to the conclusion that "arrows" ([illegible]) is the subject.

His Conquests Widening, vv. 12-15.

12. In indignation thou didst march through the earth;
In anger thou didst thresh the nations.

13. Thou didst go forth for the salvation of thy people,
For the salvation[1] of thine anointed,
Thou didst shatter the head from the house of the (wicked;
Thou didst lay bare[2] its base even to the neck.

14. Thou didst pierce with staves[3] the head of the (Perizzites;[4]
They came on as a tempest to drive us[5] away;
Their exultation was as it were to devour the poor (from a hiding place.

15. Thou didst march through the sea with thy horses,
The great waters foamed.[6]

1 - יְשׁוּעָ֫תְךָ -- The LXX has τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν Χριστόν σου instead of σωτηρίαν as in the preceding clause. For this reason Nowack and others would emend the text by reading לְהוֹשִׁיעַ an infinitive, instead of יְשׁוּעָ֫תְךָ a noun. These scholars remind us that while there are instances in which an abstract noun is used with the force of an infin. and governs the acc., these instances, they think, do not justify the present case; besides the Kal would be intrans. rather than trans. However, Kelly (Amer. Jour. of Sem. Lang. p. 155) thinks we may have here an archaic usage whereby an infin. noun is followed by an acc. He compares it to הַדַּעַת in Gen. 2:9. We retain the M. T.

2 - עֶרוֹת יְסוֹד עַד־צַוָּאר as we have it here is an infin. Abs.

His Conquests Widening, vv. 12-15.

12. In indignation thou didst march through the earth;
In anger thou didst thresh the nations.

13. Thou didst go forth for the salvation of thy people,
For the salvation[1] of thine anointed.
Thou didst shatter the head from the house of the wicked;
Thou didst lay bare[2] its base even to the neck.

14. Thou didst pierce with staves[3] the head of the
(Perizzites;[4]
They came on as a tempest to drive us[5] away;
Their exultation was as it were to devour the poor
(from a hiding place.

15. Thou didst march through the sea with thy horses,
The great waters foamed.[6]

1 - [illegible] -- The LXX has τοῦ σῶσαι τὸν Χριστόν σου instead of σωτηρίαν as in the preceding clause. For this reason Nowack and others would amend the text by reading [illegible] an infinitive, instead of [illegible] a noun. These scholars remind us that while there are instances in which an abstract noun is used with the force of an infin. and governs the acc., these instances, they think, do not justify the present case; besides the Kal would be intrans. rather than trans. However, Kelly (Amer. Jour. of Sem. Lang. p. 155) thinks we may have here an archaic usage whereby an infin. noun is followed by an acc. He compares it to [illegible] in Gen. 2:9. We retain the M. T. as we have it here is an infin. Abs-

5 - [illegible]

The usual form would be עֶרֶה or עֶרָה . However, the form in ת occurs in Isa. 22:13; Hos. 10:4. Its use in that case would be adverbial (cf. Ges.-K, 113 h, and Dav. Syn., 87). So construed it would read "laying bare the base unto the neck". The context, however, seems to demand a 2nd per. perf., following the analogy of the preceding clause. And so we would read עָרִיתָ instead of ~~עֶרֶת~~ עֲרוֹת, neck, seems to be necessary to continue the figure of רֹאשׁ head, in the preceding clause.

3 - בְּמַטֵּיו "with staves or lances". Read instead בְּמַטּוֹת (cf. Hab. 3:9).

4 - פְּרָזוֹ --Stonehouse says the word occurs only here. The LXX renders it "chief men". The evident reference is to a hostile people. The R. V. has "warriors". But we are not warranted in making such a translation from a word which means "country-people". To the writer it seems that the reference here is to one of Israel's ancient enemies. Just a slight change in the text would make it read the Perizzite. And so we would read הַפְּרִזִּי (cf. Gen. 13:7; 15:20; 34-30; Judg. 1:4-5; Ex. 3:8-17). While it is true that in the passages cited above the Perizzites are always associated with other nations, such as Canaanite, Hittite etc., still they could be named here as a type of their ancient foes. Further these other foes may have been mentioned in the text originally but dropped out. In Ezra 9:1 we note that the Perizzites are among those spoken of as being still in the country as a snare to the returned exiles. The word no doubt alluded to Israel's early conquest of Canaan.

5 - לַהֲפִיצֵנִי perhaps better לַהֲפִיצֵנוּ . The writer is talking of the struggles of his nation against an ancient foe.

The usual form would be נִגְּדוֹ or נִגְדּוֹ . However, the form in
nf occurs in Isa. 22:13; Hos. 10:4. Its use in that case would
be adverbial (cf. Ges.-K, 118 h, and Dav. Syn., 87). So con-
strued it would read "laying bare the base unto the neck". The
context, however, seems to demand a 2nd per. perf., following
the analogy of the preceding clause. And so we would read נִגְּדְתָּ
instead of נִגְּדוֹ. עַל־צַוָּאר, neck, seems to be necessary to continue
the figure of עַל־רֹאשׁ head, in the preceding clause.

3 - בַּחֲנִיתוֹת "with staves or lances". Read instead בַּחֲנִיתֹת (cf.
Hab. 3:9).

4 - תֵּרָע --Stonehouse says the word occurs only here. The LXX
renders it "chief men". The evident reference is to a hostile
people. The R. V. has "warriors". But we are not warranted
in making such a translation from a word which means "country-
people". To the writer it seems that the reference here is to
one of Israel's ancient enemies. Just a slight change in the
text would make it read the Perizzite. And so we would read
פְּרִזִּי (cf. Gen. 13:7; 15:20; 34-30; Judg. 1:4-5; Ex. 3:8-17).
While it is true that in the passages cited above the Perizzites
are always associated with other nations, such as Canaanite,
Hittite etc., still they could be named here as a type of their
ancient foes. Further these other foes may have been mentioned
in the text originally but dropped out. In Ezra 9:1 we note
that the Perizzites are among those spoken of as being still in
the country as a snare to the returned exiles. The word no
doubt alluded to Israel's early conquest of Canaan.

5 - וְהַגְבִּיהַּ perhaps better וְהַגְבִּיהַּ . The writer is talking
of the struggles of his nation against an ancient foe.

6 - חֹמֶר A. V. "heap", R. V. m, "surge". LXX ταράσσοντας .
On the basis of some of the codices of the LXX (Codd. 23, 62, 86, 147,--Dr.-Cent. B. p. 95), Wellhausen and Nowack would read חָמְרוּ for חֹמֶר which would give us, "The great waters foamed" (cf. Psa. 46:4).

The Effect of Yahweh's Manifestation upon the Poet, v. 16.

16. I heard and my body[1] trembled;
At the voice, my lips quivered;
Rottenness came into my bones
And I trembled in my place.[2]
While I waited quietly[3] for the day of affliction,
For the coming up of the people who would attack us.

1 - בִּמְעִי -- from מְעֶה "body".

2 - תַּחְתָּי -- literally, "underneath myself". An idiomatic expression meaning "in my place". (Cf. 2 Sam. 2:23; 7:10; Isa. 25:10).

3 - אָנוּחַ לְיוֹם This and the next line are very uncertain. If the text is correct it would seem to lend force to the view of Habakkuk's authorship of the Psalm, and yet not necessarily. Israel's history throughout was a repelling of foes who "came up against them to eat up their flesh". And these lines were simply commemorative of their experience through the years.

The Effect of Yahweh's Manifestation upon the Poet, v. 16.

16. I heard and my body[1] trembled;
At the voice, my lips quivered;
Rottenness came into my bones
And I trembled in my place.[2]
While I waited quietly[3] for the day of affliction,
For the coming up of the people who would attack us.

1 - רגז -- from רגז "body".

2 - מתחת -- literally, "underneath myself". An idiomatic expression meaning "in my place". (Cf. 2 Sam. 8:23; 7:10; Isa. 25:10).

3 - נוח הניח This and the next line are very uncertain. If the text is correct it would seem to lend force to the view of Habakkuk's authorship of the Psalm, and yet not necessarily. Israel's history throughout was a repelling of foes who "came up against them to eat up their flesh". And these lines were simply commemorative of their experience through the years;

An Expression of Triumphant Faith, vv. 17-19.

17. For though the fig-tree should not bud,
And there should be no fruit from the vines,
And the product of the olive-tree should fail,
And the fields should not bring forth food,
And flocks should be cut off from enclosures,
And there be no cattle in the stalls,

18. I will (still) exult in Yahweh,
I will rejoice in the God of my salvation.

19. Yahweh, the Lord, is my strength,
And he will make my feet as the hind's feet;
And upon my high-places he will cause me to walk.

For the Chief Musician on my stringed instruments.[1]

1 - Compare Psalms 4:1; 6:1; 54:1; 55:1; 67:1; 76:1.

An Expression of Triumphant Faith, vv. 17-19.

17. For though the fig-tree should not bud,
And there should be no fruit from the vines,
And the product of the olive-tree should fail,
And the fields should not bring forth food,
And flocks should be cut off from enclosures,
And there be no cattle in the stalls,

18. I will (still) exult in Yahweh,
I will rejoice in the God of my salvation.

19. Yahweh, the Lord, is my strength,
And he will make my feet as the hind's feet;
And upon my high-places he will cause me to walk.

For the Chief Musician on my stringed instruments.[1]

1 - Compare Psalms 4:1; 6:1; 54:1; 55:1; 67:1; 76:1.

IV. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE TEXT.

IV. RECONSTRUCTION OF THE TEXT.

In Section III of the Dissertation is found a "Translation based on the Metrical Arrangement of the Hebrew Text". In the present section we propose to give the original from which that translation was made.

While for centuries the third chapter of the Book of Habakkuk has been recognized as a Psalm, the book as a whole has not been considered to be poetic. A careful examination, however, of chapters one and two, brings out the fact that here also are to be found all the characteristics and peculiarities of Hebrew poetry.

In this section we give a brief survey of the forms of Hebrew poetry; analyze the book with the view of determining whether we have here poetry or not; and having convinced ourself that the whole book is poetic, we proceed to make a metrical arrangement of the Hebrew text.

A brief survey of the forms of Hebrew poetry.

In the year 1753 two epoch-making books were published, as far as Old Testament study was concerned. One was the work of Jean Astruc, questioning the authorship of the book of Genesis by Moses; the other was "De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones Academicae", by Robert Lowth. This book by Lowth was the first systematic treatment of any of the formal elements of Hebrew poetry.

Prior to Lowth there had been attempts to define the laws of Hebrew metre, to prescribe the numbers, the feet, the scanning of the lines etc. All such attempts were based on the assumption that Hebrew poetry and metre were similar in every respect

In Section III of the Dissertation is found a "Translation based on the Metrical Arrangement of the Hebrew Text". In the present section we propose to give the original from which that translation was made.

While for centuries the third chapter of the Book of Habakkuk has been recognized as a Psalm, the book as a whole has not been considered to be poetic. A careful examination, however, of chapters one and two, brings out the fact that here also are to be found all the characteristics and peculiarities of Hebrew poetry.

In this section we give a brief survey of the forms of Hebrew poetry; analyze the book with the view of determining whether we have here poetry or not; and having convinced ourself that the whole book is poetic, we proceed to make a metrical arrangement of the Hebrew text.

A brief survey of the forms of Hebrew poetry.

In the year 1753 two epoch-making books were published, as far as Old Testament study was concerned. One was the work of Jean Astruc, questioning the authorship of the book of Genesis by Moses; the other was "De Sacra Poesi Hebraeorum Praelectiones Academicae", by Robert Lowth. This book by Lowth was the first systematic treatment of any of the formal elements of Hebrew poetry.

Prior to Lowth there had been attempts to define the laws of Hebrew metre, to prescribe the numbers, the feet, the scanning of the lines etc. All such attempts were based on the assumption that Hebrew poetry and metre were similar in every respect

to the Greek and Latin. Lowth's contribution was two-fold: (1) He for the first time analyzed and expounded the parallelistic structure of Hebrew poetry: (2) He drew attention to the fact that the extent of poetry in the Old Testament was much larger than had generally been recognized.

Let us note in detail his first contribution. He made the important discovery that Hebrew poetry was not marked by rhyme or by the regulated succession of accented or unaccented, or long and short syllables, but by the arrangement of two clauses of approximately the same length; so that the second clause answers or otherwise completes the thought of the first. He called this phenomenon, "Parallelism of Members".

Bishop Lowth distinguished three primary forms of Parallelism: (1) The Synonomous; that is parallel arrangement in which the second line contains a thought identical with or similar to the thought of the first line. For example, compare Psa. 1:2.

"But his delight is in the law of Jehovah,
And in his law doth he meditate day and night."

(2) The Synthetic: Here the thought is either advanced in different ways or merely completed. Example Psa. 40:1-2.

"I waited patiently for Jehovah;
And he inclined unto me and heard my cry.
He brought me up also out of a horrible pit, out of the miry clay;
And he set my feet upon a rock, and established my goings."

(3) The Antithetic: Here the second line expresses the opposite thought from the first. Example Prov. 10: 1.

to the Greek and Latin. Lowth's contribution was two-fold: (1)
He for the first time analyzed and expounded the parallelistic
structure of Hebrew poetry: (2) He drew attention to the fact
that the extent of poetry in the Old Testament was much larger
than had generally been recognized.

Let us note in detail his first contribution. He made
the important discovery that Hebrew poetry was not marked by
rhyme or by the regulated succession of accented or unaccented,
or long and short syllables, but by the arrangement of two
clauses of approximately the same length; so that the second
clause answers or otherwise completes the thought of the first.
He called this phenomenon, "Parallelism of Members".

Bishop Lowth distinguished three primary forms of Paral-
lelism: (1) The Synonomous; that is parallel arrangement in
which the second line contains a thought identical with or simi-
lar to the thought of the first line. For example, compare
Psa. 1:2.

"But his delight is in the law of Jehovah,
And in his law doth he meditate day and night."

(2) The Synthetic: Here the thought is either advanced in dif-
ferent ways or merely completed. Example Psa. 40:1-2.

"I waited patiently for Jehovah;
And he inclined unto me and heard my cry.
He brought me up also out of a horrible pit, out of the
miry clay;
And he set my feet upon a rock, and established my
goings."

(3) The Antithetic: Here the second line expresses the opposite
thought from the first. Example Prov. 10: 1.

"A wise son maketh a glad father,

But a foolish son is the heaviness of his mother."

Bishop Lowth's views on Parallelism in Hebrew poetry were at once accepted and have maintained themselves until the present time.

The Measured Beat.

Another form of Hebrew poetry was the "Measured Beat". The measures were not of feet, as in classic Latin and Greek, but of words or word accents. That is to say, the main element in the measure of Hebrew verse was the accent or tone. Julius Ley (Die Metrischen Formen der Hebr. Poesie 1866; Grundzüge des Rythmus des vers--und Strophenbaues in der Hebr. Poesie, 1875, Leitfaden der Metrik der Hebr. Poesie, 1887) is due most of the credit for the development of the view of the measured beat in Hebrew poetry. Another scholar who accepted in the main Ley's view, and made large contributions to it, was Karl Budde (Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1882). Here, and in later articles, he analyzed the book of Lamentations, showing the great preponderance of the 3 plus 2 line, which he called the kinah verse, from the fact that it is the form used in "mournful" poetry.

The simplest measure is the trimeter, measured by three tonic or accented beats. Dr. Briggs says (Psalms, Int. Crit. Com. vol. I, p. XLI), there are 89 trimeter Psalms in the Psalter. Next to the trimeter, the pentameter or kinah was used most frequently. We have also the tetrameter and hexameter, but these were not used so frequently as the other forms.

With reference to the kinah verse Budde's position was as

"A wise son maketh a glad father,
But a foolish son is the heaviness of his mother."

Bishop Lowth's views on Parallelism in Hebrew poetry were at once accepted and have maintained themselves until the present time.

The Measured Beat.

Another form of Hebrew poetry was the "Measured Beat". The measures were not of feet, as in classic Latin and Greek, but of words or word accents. That is to say, the main element in the measure of Hebrew verse was the accent or tone. Julius Ley (Die Metrischen Formen der Hebr. Poesie 1866; Grundzüge des Rythmus des vers--und Strophenbaues in der Hebr. Poesie, 1875, Leitfaden der Metrik der Hebr. Poesie, 1887) is due most of the credit for the development of the view of the measured beat in Hebrew poetry. Another scholar who accepted in the main Ley's view, and made large contributions to it, was Karl Budde (Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, 1882). Here, and in later articles, he analyzed the book of Lamentations, showing the great preponderance of the 3 plus 2 line, which he called the Kinah verse, from the fact that it is the form used in "mournful" poetry.

The simplest measure is the trimeter, measured by three tonic or accented beats. Dr. Briggs says (Psalms, Int. Crit. Com. vol. I, p. XLI), there are 89 trimeter Psalms in the Psalter. Next to the trimeter, the pentameter or Kinah was used most frequently. We have also the tetrameter and hexameter, but these were not used so frequently as the other forms.

With reference to the Kinah verse Budde's position was as

follows: (1) The kinah measure divides the line into unequal parts of which the larger precedes the shorter part. (2) The normal length of the longer part is three words; of the shorter part, two words. (3) By legitimate variation, a longer part, consisting of four words, may be followed by a shorter, consisting of (a) three words, (b) two words. (4) The period is never equally divided. (5) Between the two periods of the verse, there is no strict and constant rhythmical relation beyond the fundamental fact of inequality of length.

He, however, would have us be on guard against assigning too great importance to Metrical regularity.

Archaic Words and Forms.

The Hebrew poets used archaic words and forms for metrical purposes, for the following reasons: (1) The archaic case endings softened the transition from word to word, and made the language more melodious. (2) The archaic suffixes and modal forms were used partly for the same purpose. (3) The archaic prepositions were employed in order to get independent words or variation in the tonic syllable (Briggs, Psalms, Vol. I, Int. Crit. Com. p. XLIII f.)

Ornamentation of Lines.

The Hebrew poets ornamented their lines by various devices. At the beginning the alphbet, in order, was used as an acrostic (Compare Psa. 119; Nah. 1; the first four chapters of Lamentations). At the end of the line a kind of rhyme, or assonance was used, (cf. Amos 8:1-2; Isa. 5:7.

The Strophe.

Another very generally accepted form of Hebrew poetry, is

follows: (1) The Kinah measure divides the line into unequal parts of which the larger precedes the shorter part. (2) The normal length of the longer part is three words; of the shorter part, two words. (3) By legitimate variation, a longer part, consisting of four words, may be followed by a shorter, consisting of (a) three words, (b) two words. (4) The period is never equally divided. (5) Between the two periods of the verse, there is no strict and constant rhythmical relation beyond the fundamental fact of inequality of length.

He, however, would have us be on guard against assigning too great importance to Metrical regularity.

Archaic Words and Forms.

The Hebrew poets used archaic words and forms for metrical purposes, for the following reasons: (1) The archaic case endings softened the transition from word to word, and made the language more melodious. (2) The archaic suffixes and modal forms were used partly for the same purpose. (3) The archaic prepositions were employed in order to get independent words or variation in the tonic syllable (Briggs, Psalms, Vol. I, Int. Crit. Com. p. XLIII f.)

Ornamentation of Lines.

The Hebrew poets ornamented their lines by various devices. At the beginning the alphabet, in order, was used as an acrostic (Compare Pss. 119; Nah. 1; the first four chapters of Lamentations). At the end of the line a kind of rhyme, or assonance was used, (cf. Amos 8:1-2; Isa. 5:7.

The Strophe.

Another very generally accepted form of Hebrew poetry, is

the Strophe. Koster (Die Strophen Oder Parallelismus der Verse der Hab. Poesie, Studien und Kritiken, 1831), who is given the credit of calling the attention of scholars to the strophical organization of Hebrew poetry, defined the strophe as any union of several verses according to definite laws. He built on Lowth's system of Parallelism and maintained that groups of verses are arranged on the same principles of parallelism as the verses themselves.

Koster gave as the first criterion of the Strophe, the refrain. It indicates either the beginning or the end of the strophe. Note Micah 3. In vv. 1, 5, and 9 we see from the opening words here the beginning of a new strophe. Another instance is Psa. 42 and 43. It seems evident that the Psalms are one by the refrain in 42:5; 42:11 and 43:5. Note also Isa. 9:8-10:4.

Another criterion is the division in the sense of the passage. In almost every passage or chapter, one or more portions naturally separate themselves from the rest. Using one of these portions as a measure, the whole poem will often be found to consist of several equal or nearly equal parts, each forming a lesser whole. Take Psalm 2 for example. The last three verses are an address to kings. Take this segment as a measure and it will be found that we have in the twelve verses of the Psalm four strophes of three verses each.

Other indications of the strophe are such expressions as "hark", "see", "woe", "when", "Thus saith Yahweh" etc.

THE POETIC FORM OF HABAKKUK.

The problem now before us is to decide whether, as judged by the forms of Hebrew poetry we have named above, the whole book

the Strophe. Koster (Die Strophen Oder Parallelismus der Verse der Heb. Poesie, Studien Kritiken, 1831), who is given the credit of calling the attention of scholars to the strophical organization of Hebrew poetry, defined the strophe as any union of several verses according to definite laws. He built on Lowth's system of Parallelism and maintained that groups of verses are arranged on the same principles of parallelism as the verses themselves.

Koster gave as the first criterion of the Strophe, the refrain. It indicates either the beginning or the end of the strophe. Note Micah 3. In vv. 1, 5, and 9 we see from the opening words here the beginning of a new strophe. Another instance is Psa. 42 and 43. It seems evident that the Psalms are one by the refrain in 42:5; 42:11 and 43:5. Note also Isa. 9:8-10:4.

Another criterion is the division in the sense of the passage. In almost every passage or chapter, one or more portions naturally separate themselves from the rest. Using one of these portions as a measure, the whole poem will often be found to consist of several equal or nearly equal parts, each forming a lesser whole. Take Psalm 2 for example. The last three verses are an address to Kings. Take this segment as a measure and it will be found that we have in the twelve verses of the Psalm four strophes of three verses each.

Other indications of the strophe are such expressions as "hark", "see", "woe", "when", "Thus saith Yahweh" etc.

THE POETIC FORM OF HABAKKUK.

The problem now before us is to decide whether, as judged by the forms of Hebrew poetry we have named above, the whole book

of Habakkuk can be considered poetic or not. It is very generally conceded that ch. 3 is a poem, but there is considerable question as to the first two chapters.

If we can find in these first two chapters undoubted examples of parallelisms, the measured beat, as seen in the accented word, archaic and poetic forms, paronomasias, acrostics--any or all of these--we have a right to think of these chapters as poetry; and then will come our other task, if it is possible, to discover the strophical organization of the book.

Our first study will deal with parallelisms. Here the primary forms are the synonomous, the synthetic, and the antithetic. Suppose we search for examples of the synonomous. F. T. Kelly (The Strophic Structure of Habakkuk, Amer. Jour. of Sem. Lang. Vol. XVIII, No. 2, Jan. 1902, pp. 94-119) finds at least fourteen synonomous parallelisms in these chapters. Let us examine some of the examples he gives to see how they square with the principles set forth in preceding pages. Take chapter 1:10 lines a and b for example:

"He scoffs at kings,
And princes are an object of derision to him."

Here we have a very clear case of a parallel arrangement in which the second line contains a thought identical with the first line.

Take another; ch. 1:13, a, b, c, d:

"Thou whose eyes are too pure to behold evil
Who art not able to look upon mischief;
Why dost thou look upon those who deal treacherously;
Art silent when the wicked swallow up those more righteous than they?"

of Habakkuk can be considered poetic or not. It is very generally conceded that ch. 3 is a poem, but there is considerable question as to the first two chapters.

If we can find in these first two chapters undoubted examples of parallelisms, the measured beat, as seen in the accented word, archaic and poetic forms, paronomasias, acrostics--any or all of these--we have a right to think of these chapters as poetry; and then will come our other task, if it is possible, to discover the strophical organization of the book.

Our first study will deal with parallelisms. Here the primary forms are the synonomous, the synthetic, and the antithetic. Suppose we search for examples of the synonomous. F. T. Kelly (The Strophic Structure of Habakkuk, Amer. Jour. of Sem. Lang. Vol. XVIII, No. 2, Jan. 1902, pp. 94-119) finds at least fourteen synonomous parallelisms in these chapters. Let us examine some of the examples he gives to see how they square with the principles set forth in preceding pages. Take chapter 1:10 lines a and b for example:

"He scoffs at kings,
And princes are an object of derision to him."

Here we have a very clear case of a parallel arrangement in which the second line contains a thought identical with the first line.

Take another; ch. 1:13, a, b, c, d:

"Thou whose eyes are too pure to behold evil
Who art not able to look upon mischief;
Why dost thou look upon those who deal treacherously;
Art silent when the wicked swallow up those more right-
eous than they?"

Here again we have another very manifest instance of the synonomous parallelism.

Some other examples are 1:15a, b; 2:1a, b, c, d; 2:5c, d, e, f.

Examples of the synthetic are just as evident. Note 1: 6a, b, and c, d:

"For behold I am raising up the Chaldeans,
A nation bitter and impetuous,
Who go through the breadths of the earth,
To possess dwelling-places not their own."

Here we have an instance in the second member of each of these parallelisms, not of the second line containing a thought identical with or similar to the one expressed in the first line, but advancing the thought expressed by the first member.

Other examples of the synthetic are 1:10c, d; 2:2b, c; 2: 3c, d; 2:9a, b.

The most outstanding example of the antithetic parallelism is furnished by 2:4a, b:

"Behold, swollen, not level is their soul within them,
But the righteous shall live by his faith."

Here we have a very clear case of the second line expressing a thought directly opposite to the first.

It would seem to be fairly well established, from our discussion that that form of Hebrew poetry known as "Parallelism of Members" is found quite frequently in the first two chapters of the book of Habakkuk.

The Measured Beat.

This form of Hebrew poetry is, if anything, more prominent.

Here again we have another very manifest instance of the synonomous parallelism.

Some other examples are 1:15a, b; 2:1a, b, c, d; 2:5c, d, e, f.

Examples of the synthetic are just as evident. Note 1: 6a, b, and c, d:

"For behold I am raising up the Chaldeans,
A nation bitter and impetuous,
Who go through the breadths of the earth,
To possess dwelling-places not their own."

Here we have an instance in the second member of each of these parallelisms, not of the second line containing a thought identical with or similar to the one expressed in the first line, but advancing the thought expressed by the first member. Other examples of the synthetic are 1:10c, d; 2:2b, c; 2:3c, d; 2:9a, b.

The most outstanding example of the antithetic parallelism is furnished by 2:4a, b:

"Behold, swollen, not level is their soul within them,
But the righteous shall live by his faith."

Here we have a very clear case of the second line expressing a thought directly opposite to the first.

It would seem to be fairly well established, from our discussion that that form of Hebrew poetry known as "Parallelism of Members" is found quite frequently in the first two chapters of the book of Habakkuk.

The Measured Beat.

This form of Hebrew poetry is, if anything, more prominent.

The measures most frequent are the trimeter, and the tetrameter measure. In v. 2 we have an example of the pentameter, or kina:

עַד־אָנָה יְהוָה שִׁוַּעְתִּי וְלֹא תִשְׁמָע

Now this complies with Budde's statement with reference to the kina measure, in at least two particulars: (1) It is divided into two unequal parts of which the longer precedes the shorter. (2) The normal length of the long part is three words; of the shorter part, two words.

As an example of the trimeter movement, taken at random, note 1:4a, b:

עַל־כֵּן תָּפוּג תּוֹרָה

וְלֹא־יֵצֵא לָנֶצַח מִשְׁפָּט

Archaic Words and Forms.

F. T. Kelly, in the article referred to above, calls attention to a number of these: in vv. 9 and 15 of ch. 1, in the case of the word כֻּלָּה , we have ה instead of the masculine suffix ן . In 2:17 we have וְחִיתָן for וְחִתָּן , that is וְחִית for וְחִתַּ . In 2:7 we have לָמוֹ , a poetical form used very frequently in the Psalms. In 1:11 זוּ is used as a relative. It is only used as such in poetry. In this same verse (1:11) we have the poetic form אֱלוֹהַּ with a suffix אֱלֹהּוֹ . This, says Kelly, is the only case of its occurrence.

Ornamentation of Lines.

Under this form of poetry we find in the book of Habakkuk, what would be called by us alliteration. Note in 1:5 the expression פֹּעַל פֹּעַל in 1:6 and 2:6 לֹא־לוֹ ; in 1:7, מִמֶּנּוּ מִשְׁפָּטוֹ ; in 1:8 פָּשׁוּ פָּרָשָׁיו in 2:9 בֹּצֵעַ בָּצַע ; in 2:18 אֱלִילִים אִלְּמִים .

In view of the fact that our study has revealed so many of

The measures most frequent are the trimeter, and the tetrameter measure. In v. 2 we have an example of the pentameter, or kina:

Now this complies with Budde's statement with reference to the kina measure, in at least two particulars: (1) It is divided into two unequal parts of which the longer precedes the shorter. (2) The normal length of the long part is three words; of the shorter part, two words.

As an example of the trimeter movement, taken at random, note I:4a, b:

Archaic Words and Forms.

P. T. Kelly, in the article referred to above, calls attention to a number of these: in vv. 9 and 15 of ch. I, in the case of the word , we have instead of the masculine suffix . In 2:17 we have for , that is for . In 2:7 we have , a poetical form used very frequently in the Psalms. In I:11 is used as a relative. It is only used as such in poetry. In this same verse (I:11) we have the poetic form with a suffix . This, says Kelly, is the only case of its occurrence.

Ornamentation of Lines.

Under this form of poetry we find in the book of Habakkuk, what would be called by us alliteration. Note in I:5 the expression in I:6 and 2:6 ; in I:7, ; in I:8 ; in 2:9 ; in 2:18 .

In view of the fact that our study has revealed so many of

the forms of Hebrew poetry as outlined in our description of these forms, we feel justified in regarding the first two chapters of Habakkuk, as well as the third, as poetry. And now for the strophical arrangement, if there is any.

Proof of the Strophe in the Book of Habakkuk.

It will be remembered that according to Koster, the criteria for the strophe were to be found in the following: the recurrence of the refrain as in Isa. 9:8-10:4; the divisions in the sense of the passage; such expressions as "hark", "see", "woe", "Thus saith Yahweh".

In the Book of Habakkuk we do not find the refrain, but we do find both of the other criteria, viz, the divisions in the sense of the passage, and such expressions as "woe".

As examples of the first, note 1:2-4; 1:5-6; 1:7-10; 11; 12; 13-14; 15-16; 17; 2:1; 2:2-4.

As examples of the second, note: 2:6b-8; 2:9-11, 2:12-14; 2:15-17; 2:18-20.

the forms of Hebrew poetry as outlined in our description of these forms, we feel justified in regarding the first two chapters of Habakkuk, as well as the third, as poetry. And now for the strophical arrangement, if there is any.

Proof of the strophe in the Book of Habakkuk.

It will be remembered that according to Koster, the criteria for the strophe were to be found in the following: the recurrence of the refrain as in Isa. 9:8-10:4; the divisions in the sense of the passage; such expressions as "Hark", "see", "woe", "Thus saith Yahweh".

In the Book of Habakkuk we do not find the refrain, but we do find both of the other criteria, viz, the divisions in the sense of the passage, and such expressions as "woe".

As examples of the first, note 1:2-4; 1:5-8; 1:7-10; 11; 12; 13-14; 15-16; 17; 2:1; 2:2-4.

As examples of the second, note: 2:6b-8; 2:9-11, 2:12-14; 2:15-17; 2:18-20.

Reconstruction of the Text of Habakkuk.

1. Dialogue between Yahweh and the Prophet, 1:1 - 2:4.

Title. (1) הַמַּשָּׂא אֲשֶׁר חָזָה חֲבַקּוּק הַנָּבִיא׃

I. The Prophet's Complaint, vv. 2-4.

(2) עַד־אָנָה יְהוָה שִׁוַּעְתִּי וְלֹא תִשְׁמָע
אֶזְעַק אֵלֶיךָ חָמָס וְלֹא תוֹשִׁיעַ׃
(3) לָמָּה תַרְאֵנִי אָוֶן וְעָמָל תַּבִּיט
וְשֹׁד וְחָמָס לְנֶגְדִּי
וַיְהִי רִיב וּמָדוֹן יִשָּׂא׃
(4) עַל־כֵּן תָּפוּג תּוֹרָה
וְלֹא־יֵצֵא לָנֶצַח מִשְׁפָּט
כִּי רָשָׁע מַכְתִּיר אֶת־הַצַּדִּיק
עַל־כֵּן יֵצֵא מִשְׁפָּט מְעֻקָּל׃

II. The Chaldeans being raised up, vv. 5-6.

(5) רְאוּ בַגּוֹיִם וְהַבִּיטוּ
וְהִתְמַהְמְהוּ[1] וּתְמָהוּ
כִּי־פֹעֵל פֹּעֵל בְּיָמֵיכֶם
לֹא תַאֲמִינוּ כִּי יְסֻפָּר׃
(6) כִּי־הִנְנִי מֵקִים אֶת־הַכַּשְׂדִּים
הַגּוֹי הַמַּר וְהַנִּמְהָר
הַהוֹלֵךְ לְמֶרְחֲבֵי־אֶרֶץ
לָרֶשֶׁת מִשְׁכְּנוֹת לֹא־לוֹ׃

1. v. 5, line b. Emend the text on the basis of Isa. 29:9, substituting for M.T., the hithpalpa'el, וְהִתְמַהְמְהוּ. See notes on translation, p. 117.

Reconstruction of the Text of Habakkuk.

I. Dialogue between Yahweh and the Prophet, 1:1 - 2:4.

Title. (1) מַשָּׂא חֲבַקּוּק הַנָּבִיא עַל־שִׁגְיֹנֹת׃

I. The Prophet's Complaint, vv. 2-4.

(2) עַד־אָנָה יְהוָה שִׁוַּעְתִּי וְלֹא תִשְׁמָע

אֶזְעַק אֵלֶיךָ חָמָס וְלֹא תוֹשִׁיעַ׃

(3) לָמָּה תַרְאֵנִי אָוֶן וְעָמָל תַּבִּיט

שֹׁד וְחָמָס נֶגְדִּי הָיוּ

וַיְהִי רִיב וְשָׂא מָדוֹן׃

(4) עַל־כֵּן תָּפוּג תּוֹרָה וְלֹא

יֵצֵא לָנֶצַח מִשְׁפָּט

כִּי רָשָׁע כֹּתֵר אֶת־הַצַּדִּיק

עַל כֵּן יֵצֵא מִשְׁפָּט מְעֻקָּל׃

II. The Chaldeans being raised up, vv. 5-8.

(5) רְאוּ בַגּוֹיִם וְהַבִּיטוּ

וְתִמְהוּ תְּמָהוּ

כִּי־פֹעֵל פֹּעֵל בִּימֵיכֶם

לֹא תַאֲמִינוּ אִם יְסֻפָּר׃

(6) כִּי־הִנְנִי מֵקִים אֶת־הַכַּשְׂדִּים

הַגּוֹי הַמַּר וְהַנִּמְהָר

הַהֹלֵךְ לְמֶרְחֲבֵי־אָרֶץ

לָרֶשֶׁת מִשְׁכְּנוֹת לֹא־לוֹ׃

Emend the text on the basis of Isa. 28:9, line b. See notes on translation, p. 117.

substituting for M.T., the birthpangs of', and

III. A detailed description of the Chaldeans, vv. 7 - 10.

(7) אֵימ וְנוֹרָא הוּא
מִמֶּנּוּ מִשְׁפָּטוֹ וּשְׂאֵתוֹ יֵצֵא׃
(8) וְקַלּוּ מִנְּמֵרִים סוּסָיו
וְחַדּוּ מִזְאֵבֵי עֶרֶב[1]
וּפָרָשָׁיו פָּרָשִׁים יָבֹאוּ
יָעֻפוּ כְּנֶשֶׁר חָשׁ לֶאֱכוֹל׃
(9) כֻּלּוֹ לְחָמָס יָבוֹא
יִתֵּן[2] פְּנֵיהֶם קָדִימָה
וַיֶּאֱסֹף כַּחוֹל שֶׁבִי׃
(10) וְהוּא בַּמְּלָכִים יִתְקָעָם
וְרוֹזְנִים מִשְׂחָק לוֹ
הוּא לְכָל־מִבְצָר יִשְׂחָק
וַיִּצְבֹּר עָפָר וַיִּלְכְּדֶהָ׃

IV. The Chaldeans' attitude changes, v. 11.

(11) אָז חָלַף רוּחַ
וַיַּעֲבֹר וְאָשֵׁם
זוּ כֹחוֹ לֵאלֹהָיו׃

1. Drop the words וּפָרָשָׁיו פָּרָשִׁים יָבֹאוּ at the end of v. 8b. See notes in translation section, p. 118.

2. מִנַּסַּת פְּנֵיהֶם. Emend the text by substituting יִתֵּן for מִנַּסַּת. Cf. Lev. 20:3, Ezek. 15:7. For full discussion see notes in translation section, p. 119.

III. A detailed description of the Chaldeans, vv. 7 - 10.

(7) אֵלֶּה רְוּחֵךְ נְאֻם

יְהוָה וְאֵין לְרוּחֵךְ נְשָׁמָה:

(8) וְקָרָה כִּי־בָאִים בְּרִבָּם

וְנִתַּךְ בְּתוֹכָהּ בְּרִיתִי

וְעַרְעַרְתִּי עַל־פְּנֵיהֶן כֹּל

כְּמוֹ־אֵשׁ בְּתוֹכָהּ אֲבַדְתִּי:

(9) כִּי־אָז אֶהְפֹּךְ אֶל־עַמִּים

שָׂפָה בְרוּרָה וְלִקְרֹא

כֻּלָּם בְּשֵׁם יְהוָה

לְעָבְדוֹ שְׁכֶם אֶחָד:

(10) מֵעֵבֶר לְנַהֲרֵי כּוּשׁ

עֲתָרַי בַּת־פּוּצַי יְבִלוּן מִנְחָה:

IV. The Chaldeans' attitude changes, v. 11.

(11) בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא לֹא

תֵבוֹשִׁי מִכֹּל

עֲלִילוֹתַיִךְ אֲשֶׁר

פָּשַׁעְתְּ־בִּי

כִּי אָז אָסִיר

מִקִּרְבֵּךְ:

1. Drop the words רְוּחֵךְ נְשָׁמָה at the end of v. 8b. See notes in translation section, p. 118.

2. בְּתוֹכָהּ בְּרִיתִי. Amend the text by substituting לִי for בְּתוֹכָהּ. Cf. Lev. 20:3, Ezek. 15:7. For full discussion see notes in translation section, p. 119.

V. The Prophet's Confidence in Yahweh, v. 12.

(12) הֲלֹוא אַתָּה מֵעֹולָם יְהוָה
אֱלֹהַי קְדֹשִׁי לֹא נָמוּת[1]
יְהוָה לְמִשְׁפָּט שַׂמְתָּהוּ
וְצוּר הֹוכַחְתָּנִי יְסַדְתָּהוּ׃

VI. The Prophet's Difficulty, vv. 13 - 14.

(13) טְהֹור עֵינַיִם מֵרְאֹות רָע
וְהַבִּיט אֵלָעָמָל לֹא תוּכָל
לָמָּה תַבִּיט בּוגְדִים
תַּחֲרִישׁ בְּבַלַּע רָשָׁע צַדִּיק מִמֶּנּוּ׃

(14) וַתַּעֲשֶׂה אָדָם כִּדְגֵי הַיָּם
כְּרֶמֶשׂ לֹא־מֹשֵׁל בֹּו׃

VII. The Chaldean Atrocities Narrated, vv. 15 - 16.

(15) כֻּלֹּו בְּחַכָּה הֶעֱלָה
יְגָרֲהוּ בְחֵרְמֹו וְיַאַסְפֵהוּ בְּמִכְמַרְתֹּו
עַל־כֵּן יִשְׂמַח וְיָגִיל׃

(16) עַל־כֵּן יְזַבֵּחַ לְחֵרְמֹו וְקַטֵּר לְמִכְמַרְתֹּו
כִּי בָהֶמָּה שָׁמֵן חֶלְקֹו
וּמַאֲכָלֹו בְּרִאָה׃

VIII. The Prophet's Question, v. 17.

(17) הֶעַל כֵּן יָרִיק חֶרְמֹו
וְתָמִיד לַהֲרֹג גֹּויִם לֹא יַחְמֹול׃

[1]Instead of נָמוּת of M.T. in v. 12b, which is undoubtedly the 1st per. plu., read נמות, Niph. Ptc. This is in harmony with the context. See notes of Translation Section, p. 121.

V. The Prophet's Confidence in Yahweh, v. 12.

(12) וַיִּשְׂגַּב יְהוָה לְמִשְׂגָּב לָנוּ
אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב סֶלָה לָנוּ[1]
וְיִשְׂגַּב יְהוָה עִמָּנוּ
וְיִשְׂגַּב אֱלֹהֵי יַעֲקֹב לָנוּ:

VI. The Prophet's Difficulty, vv. 13 - 14.

(13) אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ מַעֲלְךָ מֵאֶרֶץ
רְחַב־פֶּה וּמְלָאֵהוּ אָנֹכִי
לֹא נִבְעָה בְּרֵאתִיהוּ
אַף אֲנִי בָּרָאתִי:

(14) וְאֶתְּמֹהַן אֲדֹנָי בְּרֵאתִי נֵיתָם
בְּרֹעַ לְאֵיתָנָיו וְהוּא:

VII. The Chaldean Atrocities Narrated, vv. 15 - 16.

(15) בְּחֹרֶשׁ בְּנֵיתָם אֲלֵיהֶם
וְיִרְמְיָהוּ בְּנֵיתָם לְאֵיתָנָיו
בְּרֹעַ לְאֵיתָנָיו וְהוּא:

(16) אֲשֶׁר בְּרֵאתִי אֲלֵיהֶם אֲלֵיהֶם
בְּרֹעַ לְאֵיתָנָיו וְהוּא:

VIII. The Prophet's Question, v. 17.

(17) מַה־בְּרֵאתִי אֲלֵיהֶם
וְיִרְמְיָהוּ בְּנֵיתָם לְאֵיתָנָיו:

[1] Instead of נתן of M.T. in v. 12b, which is undoubtedly the 1at per. plu., read נתן, High. Etc. This is in harmony with the context. See notes of Translation Section, p. 121.

IX. The Prophet Awaiting Yahweh's Answer, Ch. 2:1.

(1) עַל־מִשְׁמַרְתִּי אֶעֱמֹדָה
וְאֶתְיַצְּבָה עַל־מָצוֹר
וַאֲצַפֶּה לִרְאוֹת מַה־יְדַבֶּר־בִּי
וּמָה אָשִׁיב[1] עַל־תּוֹכַחְתִּי׃

X. Yahweh's Answer, vv. 2 - 4.

(2) וַיַּעֲנֵנִי יְהוָה וַיֹּאמֶר
כְּתֹב חָזוֹן וּבָאֵר עַל־הַלָּחוֹת
לְמַעַן יָרוּץ קוֹרֵא בּוֹ׃
(3) כִּי עוֹד חָזוֹן לַמּוֹעֵד
וְיָפֵחַ לַקֵּץ וְלֹא יְכַזֵּב
אִם־יִתְמַהְמָהּ חַכֵּה־לוֹ
כִּי־בֹא יָבֹא לֹא יְאַחֵר׃
הִנֵּה עֻפְּלָה לֹא־יְשָׁרָה נַפְשׁוֹ בּוֹ
וְצַדִּיק בֶּאֱמוּנָתוֹ יִחְיֶה׃

1. אָשִׁיב, 2:1d. Emend the text by use of יָשִׁיב instead.
See notes in translation section, p. 124.

IX. The Prophet Awaiting Yahweh's Answer, Ch. 8:1.

(1) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] I

X. Yahweh's Answer, vv. 5 - 9.

(2) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(3) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

1. כתיב, 8:12. Emend the text by use of כתיב instead.
See notes in translation section, p. 124.

In 1:1 we have the title of the book: "The Revelation Which Habakkuk the Prophet saw."

In this section (1:2-2:4) we have ten strophes. The first strophe is contained in vv. 2-4. The criterion here, as in the great majority of instances where the strophe is found, is the division in the sense of the passage. The question as to how we are to be sure when we have a change in the sense of the passage is a matter to be determined by the individual student.

Our first strophe, vv. 2-4, is composed of nine lines. The first three lines follow the Pentameter or kinah movement. This movement was first observed by Budde in the Book of Lamentations, and is the regular form used in the dirge. The other six lines of this strophe vary from the movement of the first three, and seem equally divided between the trimeter and the tetrameter movements. We say "seem equally divided", because, due to our limited knowledge of Hebrew metre we cannot be sure whether some of the long lines are only apparently so or not. It may be that some of the shorter words were considered as part of the following words, so far as accent was concerned. This would seem probable in view of the prevailing regularity of the trimeter movement.

However, following the present plan of accentuation and measurement, the fourth line would follow the trimeter movement; the fifth, the trimeter. The sixth and seventh lines are trimeters; the eighth and ninth are probably tetrameters.

In this strophe the poet complains of Yahweh's apparent lack of interest in good people who are suffering from the

In I:1 we have the title of the book: "The Revelation
Which Habakkuk the Prophet saw."

In this section (I:2-S:4) we have ten strophes. The
first strophe is contained in vv. 2-4. The criterion here, as
in the great majority of instances where the strophe is found,
is the division in the sense of the passage. The question as
to how we are to be sure when we have a change in the sense of
the passage is a matter to be determined by the individual
student.

Our first strophe, vv. 2-4, is composed of nine lines.
The first three lines follow the Pentameter or Kinah movement.
This movement was first observed by Budde in the Book of Lamen-
tations, and is the regular form used in the dirge. The other
six lines of this strophe vary from the movement of the first
three, and seem equally divided between the trimeter and the
tetrameter movements. We say "seem equally divided", because,
due to our limited knowledge of Hebrew metre we cannot be sure
whether some of the long lines are only apparently so or not.
It may be that some of the shorter words were considered as
part of the following words, so far as accent was concerned.
This would seem probable in view of the prevailing regularity
of the trimeter movement.

However, following the present plan of accentuation and
measurement, the fourth line would follow the trimeter movement;
the fifth, the trimeter. The sixth and seventh lines are tri-
meters; the eighth and ninth are probably tetrameters.

In this strophe the poet complains of Yahweh's apparent
lack of interest in good people who are suffering from the

results of the miscarriage of justice. It does not appear to the writer that we could separate any of these lines from the rest of the passage without destroying the sense of the passage. And so we give it as our view that these verses (2-4) form the first strophe.

The second strophe is contained in vv. 5 and 6 and consists of eight lines. In v. 5 we have the trimeter movement; in v. 6, for the most part, we have the trimeter also. Only in the first line do we seem to have an exception. This line seems to be tetrameter.

There is no question in these verses with reference to the change in the sense of the passage. In the preceding strophe the poet was complaining about the unsatisfactory conditions around him. Here we have Yahweh's response to his complainings. The Chaldeans, a bitter and impetuous nation, will be raised up to avenge their wrongs.

The third strophe is comprised in vv. 7-10 and consists of thirteen lines. Here again the measure is considerably mixed, the division being almost equal between the trimeter and the tetrameter. In v. 7 we have one trimeter, and one tetrameter. V. 8 consisting of four lines, has two trimeters (the first two) and two tetrameters (the last two). In v. 9 there are three lines, all having the trimeter movement. V. 10 consists of four lines: Only the second has the trimeter movement, the other three being tetrameters.

In this third strophe the poet describes in detail the warlike qualities of the Chaldeans.

The fourth strophe is a short one of three lines, and is

results of the miscarriage of justice. It does not appear to the writer that we could separate any of these lines from the rest of the passage without destroying the sense of the passage. And so we give it as our view that these verses (2-4) form the first strophe.

The second strophe is contained in vv. 5 and 6 and consists of eight lines. In v. 5 we have the trimeter movement; in v. 6, for the most part, we have the trimeter also. Only in the first line do we seem to have an exception. This line seems to be tetrameter.

There is no question in these verses with reference to the change in the sense of the passage. In the preceding strophe the poet was complaining about the unsatisfactory conditions around him. Here we have Yahweh's response to his complainings. The Chaldeans, a bitter and impetuous nation, will be raised up to avenge their wrongs.

The third strophe is comprised in vv. 7-10 and consists of thirteen lines. Here again the measure is considerably mixed, the division being almost equal between the trimeter and the tetrameter. In v. 7 we have one trimeter, and one tetrameter. V. 8 consisting of four lines, has two trimeters (the first two) and two tetrameters (the last two). In v. 9 there are three lines, all having the trimeter movement. V. 10 consists of four lines: Only the second has the trimeter movement, the other three being tetrameters.

In this third strophe the poet describes in detail the warlike qualities of the Chaldeans.

The fourth strophe is a short one of three lines, and is

contained in v. 11. The movement here is the trimeter. In this strophe the attitude of the would-be avenger changes. He whom Yahweh raised up to be His avenger, himself, becomes an offender: in that he imputes his success to his own powers.

The fifth strophe is found in v. 12, and consists of four lines. All are trimeter, except the first, which is tetrameter.

Here the poet reminds Yahweh of his undying qualities and recalls the purpose for which the Chaldeans were raised up.

The sixth strophe is contained in vv. 13 and 14, and consists of six lines. V. 13 contains four lines, and the tetrameter is the prevailing movement: the first two lines being tetrameter; the third trimeter; and the fourth pentameter. V. 14 contains two lines, one trimeter and one tetrameter.

In this strophe the prophet complains to Yahweh of the injustice of raising up an avenger to punish a people who are more righteous than the agent raised up to punish them.

The seventh strophe is contained in vv. 15 and 16 and consists of six lines. In v. 15, lines one and three are trimeter, while line two is pentameter. In v. 16, the first line is pentameter; the second, trimeter; and the third, a dimeter, which Kelly (Strophic Structure of Habakkuk, p. 105) says belongs to a class of parallelisms very common in the Psalms. In the cases that he cites (2:11; 9:9; 12:3), the first line makes a full statement, and this statement is repeated in different form, and with fewer words, in the second line.

Here again the prophet describes in detail the blood-thirsty disposition of his nation's conquerors.

contained in v. 11. The movement here is the trimeter. In this strophe the attitude of the would-be avenger changes. He whom Yahweh raised up to be His avenger, himself, becomes an offender: in that he imputes his success to his own powers.

The fifth strophe is found in v. 12, and consists of four lines. All are trimeter, except the first, which is tetrameter.

Here the poet reminds Yahweh of his undying qualities and recalls the purpose for which the Chaldeans were raised up.

The sixth strophe is contained in vv. 13 and 14, and consists of six lines. V. 13 contains four lines, and the tetrameter is the prevailing movement: the first two lines being tetrameter; the third trimeter; and the fourth pentameter. V. 14 contains two lines, one trimeter and one tetrameter.

In this strophe the prophet complains to Yahweh of the injustice of raising up an avenger to punish a people who are more righteous than the agent raised up to punish them.

The seventh strophe is contained in vv. 15 and 16 and consists of six lines. In v. 15, lines one and three are trimeter, while line two is pentameter. In v. 16, the first line is pentameter; the second, trimeter; and the third, a dimeter, which Kelly (Strophic Structure of Habakkuk, p. 105) says belongs to a class of parallelisms very common in the Psalms. In the cases that he cites (2:11; 9:9; 12:3), the first line makes a full statement, and this statement is repeated in different form, and with fewer words, in the second line.

Here again the prophet describes in detail the bloodthirsty disposition of his nation's conquerors.

The eighth strophe is found in v. 17, and contains only two lines. The first line is trimeter; the second tetrameter.

The prophet wonders if this wholesale slaughter of the nations is to be kept up indefinitely.

The ninth strophe is contained in ch. 2:1, and consists of four lines. The first, second and fourth have the trimeter movement, while the third is of tetrameter.

The prophet proposes to stand on his watch-tower and see what answer Yahweh will return him.

The tenth strophe is contained in vv. 2-4 of ch. 2, and consists of nine lines. In v. 2, the first and third lines are trimeters, the second tetrameter. In v. 3 there are four lines, all of which have the trimeter movement except the second, which is a tetrameter. In v. 4, there are two lines, the first being a tetrameter; the second a trimeter.

Here we have Yahweh's answer to the prophet's complaint above.

There is an appointed time of reckoning for this haughty nation, drunk with conquests. It has not yet come, but will surely come, because his soul is puffed up in him; but the righteous shall live by his faith.

In our study of this section we note that the prevailing measures are the trimeter and the tetrameter, with now and then a pentameter, and at least once, a dimeter.

2. The Woes, 2:5-20.

I. The Prophet's Comment, v. 5.

(5) וְאַף כַּיַּיִן[1] בֹּגֵד
גֶּבֶר יָהִיר וְלֹא יִרְוֶה[2]
אֲשֶׁר הִרְחִיב כִּשְׁאוֹל נַפְשׁוֹ
וְהוּא כַּמָּוֶת וְלֹא יִשְׂבָּע
וַיֶּאֱסֹף אֵלָיו כָּל־הַגּוֹיִם
וַיִּקְבֹּץ אֵלָיו כָּל־הָעַמִּים׃

II. A Prose Introduction to the Woes, v. 6a.

(6a) הֲלוֹא־אֵלֶּה כֻּלָּם עָלָיו מָשָׁל יִשָּׂא
וּמְלִיצָה חִידוֹת לוֹ וַיֹּאמַר[3]

III. The First Woe, vv. 6b - 8.

(6b) הוֹי הַמַּרְבֶּה לֹא־לוֹ[4]
וּמַכְבִּיד עָלָיו עַבְטִים׃
(7) הֲלוֹא פֶּתַע יָקוּמוּ נֹשְׁכֶיךָ
וְיִקְצוּ מְזַעְזְעֶיךָ
וְהָיִיתָ לְמִשִּׁסָּה לָמוֹ׃
(8) כִּי־אַתָּה שָׁלַלְתָּ גּוֹיִם רַבִּים
יְשָׁלּוּךָ כָּל־יֶתֶר עַמִּים
מִדְּמֵי אָדָם וַחֲמַס־אֶרֶץ
קִרְיָה וְכָל־יֹשְׁבֵי בָהּ׃

[1] כִּי־הַיַּיִן. Instead of M.T., read כַּיַּיִן. See notes in translation section. p. 126.

[2] יִנְוֶה. Read instead, with Nowack, Wellhausen and Marti, יִרְוֶה. See notes in translation section, p. 126.

[3] וַיֹּאמַר, v. 6a. Instead read with Nowack וַיֹּאמְרוּ. See p. 128.

[4] עַד־לָמָה. Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, think it a gloss. With This view the writer agrees. See p. 128.

3. The Woes, 5:8-20.

I. The Prophet's Comment, v. 8.

(8) [illegible][1]

[illegible][2]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

II. A Prose Introduction to the Woes, v. 8a.

(8a) [illegible]

[illegible][3]

III. The First Woe, vv. 8b - 8.

(8b) [illegible][4]

[illegible]:

(7) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]:

(8) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]:

[1] [illegible]. Instead of M.T., read [illegible]. See notes in translation section, p. 128.

[2] [illegible]. Read instead, with Nowack, Wellhausen and Marti, [illegible]. See notes in translation section, p. 128.

[3] [illegible], v. 8a. Instead read with Nowack [illegible]. See p. 128.

[4] [illegible]. Wellhausen, Nowack, Marti, think it a gloss. With this view the writer agrees. See p. 128.

IV. The Second Woe, vv. 9 - 11.

(9) הוֹי בֹּצֵעַ בֶּצַע רָע לְבֵיתוֹ
לָשׂוּם בַּסָּלַע קִנּוֹ
לְהִנָּצֵל מִכַּף־רָע׃

(10) יָעַצְתָּ בֹשֶׁת לְבֵיתֶךָ
קָצוֹתָ[1] עַמִּים רַבִּים
וְחֹטֵאת[2] נַפְשֶׁךָ׃

(11) כִּי־אֶבֶן מִקִּיר תִּזְעָק
וְכָפִיס מֵעֵץ יַעֲנֶנָּה׃

V. The Third Woe, vv. 12 - 14.

(12) הוֹי בֹּנֶה עִיר בְּדָמִים
וְכוֹנֵן קִרְיָה בְּעַוְלָה׃

(13) הֲלוֹא הִנֵּה מֵאֵת יְהוָה צְבָאוֹת
וְיִיגְעוּ עַמִּים בְּדֵי־אֵשׁ
וּלְאֻמִּים בְּדֵי־רִיק יֵעָפוּ׃

(14) כִּי תִמָּלֵא הָאָרֶץ
לָדַעַת אֶת־כְּבוֹד יְהוָה
כַּמַּיִם יְכַסּוּ עַל־יָם׃

[1] קָצוֹת in M.T. should be read קָצוֹתָ, following the LXX. See notes in translation section, p. 129.

[2] וְחוֹמֵא in M.T. should read וְחֹטֵאת See notes in translation section. p. 129.

IV. The Second Nos. אא. 9 - 11.

(9) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]:

(10) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]:

[illegible]

V. The Third Nos. אא. 12 - 14.

[illegible]:

(11) [illegible]

[illegible]:

(12) [illegible]

[illegible]:

(13) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]:

(14) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]:

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

VI. The Fourth Woe, vv. 15 - 17.

(15) הוֹי מַשְׁקֵה רֵעֵהוּ
סֹפֵחַ חֲמָתְךָ[1] וְאַף שַׁכֵּר
לְמַעַן הַבִּיט עַל־מְעוֹרֵיהֶם׃
(16) שָׂבַעְתָּ קָלוֹן מִכָּבוֹד
שְׁתֵה גַם־אַתָּה וְהֵרָעֵל[2]
תִּסֹּב עָלֶיךָ כּוֹס יְמִין יְהוָה
וְקִיקָלוֹן עַל־כְּבוֹדֶךָ׃
(17) כִּי חֲמַס לְבָנוֹן וְכִשְׁדַּ
וְשֹׁד בְּהֵמוֹת יְחִיתָן
מִדְּמֵי אָדָם וַחֲמַס־אֶרֶץ
קִרְיָה וְכָל־יֹשְׁבֵי בָהּ׃

[1] סְפֵחַ חֲמָתְךָ, v. 15b. Read instead סֹפֵחַ חֲמָתְךָ. See notes in translation section, p. 131.

[2] וְהֵרָעֵל, v. 16b (last word). Read instead וְהֵרָעֵל. See notes in translation section, p. 132.

VI. The Fourth Noe, vv. 15 - 17.

(15) וַיַּרְא אֹתָם רָעָה

כִּי נִסְּתָה [1] וְאֵין בָּהֶם

לְעֵת מְצָאָה וְלֹא מָצְאוּ:

(16) וַיַּרְא אֹתָם וַיִּרְפֵּם אֲדֹנִי

וְנִם כֹּה־אָמַר יִשְׁבְּרֵם [2]

אֵתֶה בְּרֵיהֶם כִּי רָעָה רָאוּ

וְיִתְרַפְּאוּ בְּרֵיהֶם:

(17) כִּי נִם כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה

לְאֵר וְנִלְאֵיתִי לְרַפֵּא

אֲרוֹג אֹתָה וְנִם־אֲנִי

אֶרְפָּא וְנִלְאֵיתִי לְרַפֵּא:

[1] וְנִסְּתָה, v. 15b. Read instead וְנִסְּתָה. See notes in translation section, p. 181.

[2] יִשְׁבְּרֵם, v. 16b (last word). Read instead יִשְׁבְּרֵם. See notes in translation section, p. 182.

VII. The Fifth Woe, vv. 18 - 20.

(18) מָה־הוֹעִיל פֶּסֶל כִּי פְסָלוֹ יְצֻרוֹ
מַסֵּכָה וּמוֹרֶה שָׁקֶר
כִּי בָטַח יֹצֵר יִצְרוֹ עָלָיו
לַעֲשׂוֹת אֱלִילִים אִלְמִים:
(19) הוֹי אֹמֵר לָעֵץ הָקִיצָה
עוּרִי לָאֶבֶן דּוּמָם
הִנֵּה־[1]הוּא תָּפוּשׂ זָהָב וָכֶסֶף
וְכָל־רוּחַ אֵין בְּקִרְבּוֹ:
(20) וַיהוָה בְּהֵיכַל קָדְשׁוֹ
חֲסֹ֥ם מִפָּנָיו כָּל־הָאָרֶץ:

[1] הוא יורה, v. 19c, seems to be a gloss -- Nowack, Bib. Heb. Translation, p. 133.

VII. The Fifth Roe, vv. 18 - 20.

(18) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(19) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

(20) [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible][1]

[1] [illegible], v. 190, seems to be a [illegible] -- Howard, Bib. Heb. Translation, p. 133.

In the second section (2:5-20) our problem is made considerably easier, so far as the strophical arrangement is concerned. Here we have not only the "division in the sense of the passage" to help in determining the beginning and ending of the strophe, but the constantly recurring expression, "Woe" at the beginning of several paragraphs. So that it is pretty generally agreed that we have here six strophes.

Using this expression "Woe", which regularly recurs at the beginning of a paragraph, as a criterion, we find the following verses form separate strophes: vv. 6b-8; 9-11; 12-14; 16-17; 18-20. This leaves only v. 5 unaccounted for, which is clearly a separate strophe, on the basis of the difference in the sense of the passage.

In the first strophe, v. 5, there are six lines, all of which, except the third, have the trimeter movement.

In this strophe the text offers considerable difficulty. If our slight emendation is correct, the sense of the passage is that the Chaldean is, like a man filled with wine. He does not know when he has enough, making conquests but insists on overrunning all the nations; and in making all peoples his victims.

In the second strophe, vv. 6b-8, we have the first of the "taunt songs". Because of his overbearing attitude, the Chaldean is going to cause the many nations he has plundered to rise up against him, and he be for booty unto them.

The first part of v. 6 is a prose introduction to the strophe which begins with 6b. This strophe consists of eight lines, one of which is followed by a refrain. The prevailing measure here is the trimeter. The two exceptions to this are

In the second section (2:5-20) our problem is made considerably easier, so far as the strophical arrangement is concerned. Here we have not only the "division in the sense of the passage" to help in determining the beginning and ending of the strophe, but the constantly recurring expression, "Woe" at the beginning of several paragraphs. So that it is pretty generally agreed that we have here six strophes.

Using this expression "Woe", which regularly recurs at the beginning of a paragraph, as a criterion, we find the following verses form separate strophes: vv. 6b-8; 9-11; 12-14; 15-17; 18-20. This leaves only v. 5 unaccounted for, which is clearly a separate strophe, on the basis of the difference in the sense of the passage.

In the first strophe, v. 5, there are six lines, all of which, except the third, have the trimeter movement.

In this strophe the text offers considerable difficulty. If our slight emendation is correct, the sense of the passage is that the Chaldean is a man filled with wine. He does not know when he has enough, but insists on overrunning all the nations; and in making all peoples his victims.

In the second strophe, vv. 6b-8, we have the first of the "taunt songs". Because of his overbearing attitude, the Chaldean is going to cause the many nations he has plundered to rise up against him, and he be for booty unto them.

The first part of v. 6 is a prose introduction to the strophe which begins with 6b. This strophe consists of eight lines, one of which is followed by a refrain. The prevailing measure here is the trimeter. The two exceptions to this are

the second line of v. 7, which is the refrain, and the first line of v. 8.

The third strophe is contained in vv. 9-11, and consists of eight lines. Here also the trimeter movement is the prevailing measure: the exceptions being the first line of v.9, which is a tetrameter; the third line of v. 9, which is a dimeter; and the third line of v. 10, which is also a dimeter.

The fourth strophe is contained in vv. 12-14. Here again we have an eight line strophe, arranged as follows: v. 12 consisting of two lines; v. 13 of three lines; v. 14 of three lines. In this strophe the trimeter movement prevails, except in the first line of v. 13, where we have the pentameter.

It is interesting to note that in this strophe there is no direct address made to the oppressor as in the other three woes.

The fifth strophe is contained in vv. 15-17, and consists of ten lines and a refrain. The trimeter movement is the prevailing measure. The exceptions are the second line of v. 15, which is a tetrameter, and the third line of v. 16. The refrain follows the last regular line of v. 17.

The sixth strophe is contained in vv. 18-20, and consists of ten lines. The exceptions to the prevailing trimeter movement are: the first and third lines of v. 18; and the fourth line of v. 19,--all of these being tetrameters. A number of scholars would have v. 18 precede v. 19 in order that the "woe" may stand at the beginning of the strophe; but this does not seem necessary to the writer for the following reasons: It is clear that v. 18 cannot be logically connected with the preceding

the second line of v. 7, which is the refrain, and the first line of v. 8.

The third strophe is contained in vv. 9-11, and consists of eight lines. Here also the trimeter movement is the prevailing measure; the exceptions being the first line of v. 9, which is a tetrameter; the third line of v. 9, which is a dimeter; and the third line of v. 10, which is also a dimeter.

The fourth strophe is contained in vv. 12-14. Here again we have an eight line strophe, arranged as follows: v. 12 consisting of two lines; v. 13 of three lines; v. 14 of three lines. In this strophe the trimeter movement prevails, except in the first line of v. 13, where we have the pentameter.

It is interesting to note that in this strophe there is no direct address made to the oppressor as in the other three woes.

The fifth strophe is contained in vv. 15-17, and consists of ten lines and a refrain. The trimeter movement is the prevailing measure. The exceptions are the second line of v. 15, which is a tetrameter, and the third line of v. 16. The refrain follows the last regular line of v. 17.

The sixth strophe is contained in vv. 18-20, and consists of ten lines. The exceptions to the prevailing trimeter movement are: the first and third lines of v. 18; and the fourth line of v. 19,--all of these being tetrameters. A number of scholars would have v. 18 precede v. 19 in order that the "woe" may stand at the beginning of the strophe; but this does not seem necessary to the writer for the following reasons: It is clear that v. 18 cannot be logically connected with the preceding

strophe because of the unmistakable difference in the sense of the two passages; and the further fact that this expression "Woe" at the beginning of the strophe is not by any means our only criterion for determining when we have a strophe. As a matter of fact, in the great majority of cases, it is determined by the "division in the sense of the passage". And finally, the one thing which seems to the writer very apparent from his study of Hebrew Metre, is the manifest insistence of the Hebrew poet on absolute freedom in the matter of the form in which he would express himself. The fact that we find trimeters, and tetrameters, and pentameters all together in one strophe shows that he did not lay great stress on consistency, so far as it had to do with the form of his poetic expression.

3. The Psalm, Ch. 3.

Title, 3:1.

(1) תְּפִלָּה לְחַבַּקּוּק הַנָּבִיא עַל שִׁגְיֹנֹת׃

I. The Prayer, v. 2.

(2) יְהוָה שָׁמַעְתִּי שִׁמְעֶךָ
יָרֵאתִי יְהוָה פָּעָלְךָ
בְּקֶרֶב שָׁנִים חַיֵּהוּ
בְּקֶרֶב שָׁנִים תּוֹדִיעַ
בְּרֹגֶז רַחֵם תִּזְכֹּר׃

II. Yahweh's brilliant approach, vv. 3 - 4.

(3) אֱלוֹהַּ מִתֵּימָן יָבוֹא
וְקָדוֹשׁ מֵהַר־פָּארָן (סֶלָה)
כִּסָּה שָׁמַיִם הוֹדוֹ
וּתְהִלָּתוֹ מָלְאָה הָאָרֶץ׃

(4) וְנֹגַהּ כָּאוֹר תִּהְיֶה
קַרְנַיִם מִיָּדוֹ לוֹ
וְשָׁם חֲבִיוֹן עֻזּוֹ׃

3. The Psalm, Ch. 3.

Title, 3:1.

I. The Prayer, v. 2.

III. Some Effects of Yahweh's Coming, vv. 5 - 6.

(5) לְפָנָיו יֵלֶךְ דָּבֶר
וְיֵצֵא רֶשֶׁף לְרַגְלָיו׃
(6) עָמַד וַיְמֹדֵד[1] אָרֶץ
רָאָה וַיְתַר גּוֹיִם
וַיִּתְפֹּצְצוּ הָרְרֵי־עַד
שַׁחוּ גִּבְעוֹת עוֹלָם
הֲלִיכוֹת עוֹלָם לוֹ׃

IV. An Inquiry of Yahweh, vv. 7 - 8.

(7) תַּחַת אָוֶן רָאִיתִי אָהֳלֵי כוּשָׁן
יִרְגְּזוּ יְרִיעוֹת אֶרֶץ מִדְיָן׃
(8) הֲבַהָרִים[2] חָרָה יְהוָה
אִם בַּנְּהָרִים אַפֶּךָ
אִם־בַּיָּם עֶבְרָתֶךָ
כִּי תִרְכַּב עַל־סוּסֶיךָ
מַרְכְּבֹתֶיךָ יְשׁוּעָה׃

[1] Instead of the M.T. וַיְמֹדֵד, v. 6a, read וַיְמֹדֵד. See notes in translation section, p. 136.

[2] Instead of the M.T. הַבְּנָהָרִים, read with G. A. Smith הֲבַהָרִים. See notes in translation section, p. 137.

[1] Instead of the M.T. וְהָרַג, v. 6a, read וְהִדִּיחַ. See notes in translation section, p. 186.

[2] Instead of the M.T. וְנָתַן, read with G: K. Smith וְנָתַץ. See notes in translation section, p. 187.

V. Yahweh in the Guise of a Warrior, vv. 9 - 11.

(9) עוֹרֵר[1] תְּעוּרָה קַשְׁתֶּךָ
שְׁבֻעֹתַ[2] מַטּוֹת אִמְרָה סֶלָה
נְהָרוֹת תְּבַקַּע־אָרֶץ׃
(10) רָאוּךָ יָחִילוּ הָרִים
זֶרֶם מָיִם עָבָר[3]
נָתַן תְּהוֹם קוֹלוֹ
רוֹם יָדָיו נָשָׂא׃
(11) שֶׁמֶשׁ יָרֵחַ עָמַד זְבֻלָּה
לְאוֹר חִצֶּיךָ יְהַלֵּכוּ
לְנֹגַהּ בְּרַק חֲנִיתֶךָ׃

[1] Instead of M.T. read, with Wellhausen and Nowack, עוֹרֵר תְּעוֹרֵר. See notes in translation section, p. 138.

[2] Instead of M.T. read שְׁבֻעָתַ. See notes in translation section, p. 138. See also explanation of reading אִמְרָה, same line, p. 138.

[3] Instead of M.T. read as above. See notes in translation section, p. 139.

V. Yahweh in the Guise of a Warrior, vv. 9 - 11.

VI. Yahweh's Conquests Widening, vv. 12 - 15.

(12) בְּזַעַם תִּצְעַד־אָרֶץ
בְּאַף תָּדוּשׁ גּוֹיִם׃
(13) יָצָאתָ לְיֵשַׁע עַמֶּךָ
לְיֵשַׁע אֶת־מְשִׁיחֶךָ
מָחַצְתָּ רֹאשׁ מִבֵּית רָשָׁע
עָרִיתָ[1] יְסוֹד עַד־צַוָּאר (סֶלָה)׃
(14) נָקַבְתָּ בְמַטּוֹת[2] רֹאשׁ הַפְּרָזָיו[3]
יִסְעֲרוּ לַהֲפִיצֵנִי
עֲלִיצָתָם כְּמוֹ־לֶאֱכֹל עָנִי בַּמִּסְתָּר׃
(15) דָּרַכְתָּ בַיָּם סוּסֶיךָ
חֹמֶר[4] מַיִם רַבִּים׃

[1] Instead of M.T. עָרוֹת, read עָרִיתָ. See notes in translation section, page 141.

[2] Instead of M.T. בְּמַטָּיו, read בְּמַטּוֹת. See notes in translation section, page 142.

[3] Instead of M.T. פְּרָזָו, read הַפְּרָזָיו. See notes in translation section, page 142.

[4] Instead of M.T. חֹמֶר, read חֹמְרוּ. See notes in translation section, page 143.

VI. Yabweh's Conquests Widening, vv. 15 - 18.

VII. The Effect of Yahweh's Manifestations upon the Poet, v. 16.

(16) שָׁמַעְתִּי וַתִּרְגַּז בִּטְנִי
לְקוֹל צָלְלוּ שְׂפָתָי
יָבוֹא רָקָב בְּעַצְמָי
וְתַחְתַּי אֶרְגָּז
אֲשֶׁר אָנוּחַ לְיוֹם צָרָה
לַעֲלוֹת לְעַם יְגוּדֶנּוּ׃

VIII. An Expression of Triumphant Faith, vv. 17 - 19.

(17) כִּי־תְאֵנָה לֹא־תִפְרָח
וְאֵין יְבוּל בַּגְּפָנִים
כִּחֵשׁ מַעֲשֵׂה־זָיִת
וּשְׁדֵמוֹת לֹא־עָשָׂה אֹכֶל
גָּזַר מִמִּכְלָאָה צֹאן
וְאֵין בָּקָר בָּרְפָתִים׃
(18) וַאֲנִי בַּיהוָה אֶעְלֹזָה
אָגִילָה בֵּאלֹהֵי יִשְׁעִי׃
(19) יְהוִה אֲדֹנָי חֵילִי
וַיָּשֶׂם רַגְלַי כָּאַיָּלוֹת
וְעַל־בָּמֳתַי יַדְרִכֵנִי
לַמְנַצֵּחַ בִּנְגִינוֹתָי׃

VII. The Effect of Yahweh's Manifestations upon the Poet, v. 16.

In ch. 3, besides the superscription in v. 1 and the subscription after v. 19, we seem to have eight strophes. While we have occasional variations from it, the movement in the main seems to be trimeter.

The first strophe is v. 2, the prayer. Here we have five lines and the measure is quite regular. The second strophe is composed of vv. 3-4. Here we have a manifest change of thought. The prayer is ended and the author is concerned with the majesty and brilliance of Yahweh as he approaches. This strophe is composed of seven lines and the measure is regular.

The third strophe is composed of vv. 5-6, seven lines, and describes some of the effects of Yahweh's approach. "Before him went the pestilence, and firebolts went out from his feet."

The fourth strophe is found in vv. 7-8, and is also composed of seven lines. Here in v. 7 we note some variation from the trimeter movement.

The fifth strophe is found in vv. 9, 10, 11, ten lines. Here Yahweh is described as a warrior who has laid bare his bow, and who is advancing upon his enemies, or the enemies of Israel, fully panoplied for war. Nature is the first victim; the mountains writhed in pain; the clouds poured forth water.

The sixth strophe is found in vv. 12, 13, 14, 15, eleven lines. The nations now are beginning to feel the effects of Yahweh's fury. In anger he threshes the nations. He goes forth for the salvation of his anointed. We have several variations from the regular movement here: line 3, v. 13; lines 1 and 3 v. 14.

In ch. 3, besides the superscription in v. 1 and the subscription after v. 19, we seem to have eight strophes. While we have occasional variations from it, the movement in the main seems to be trimeter.

The first strophe is v. 2, the prayer.

Here we have five lines and the measure is quite regular. The second strophe is composed of vv. 3-4. Here we have a manifest change of thought. The prayer is ended and the author is concerned with the majesty and brilliance of Yahweh as he approaches. This strophe is composed of seven lines and the measure is regular.

The third strophe is composed of vv. 5-6, seven lines, and describes some of the effects of Yahweh's approach. "Before him went the pestilence, and firebolts went out from his feet."

The fourth strophe is found in vv. 7-8, and is also composed of seven lines. Here in v. 7 we note some variation from the trimeter movement.

The fifth strophe is found in vv. 9, 10, 11, ten lines. Here Yahweh is described as a warrior who has laid bare his bow, and who is advancing upon his enemies, or the enemies of Israel, fully panoplied for war. Nature is the first victim; the mountains writhed in pain; the clouds poured forth water.

The sixth strophe is found in vv. 12, 13, 14, 15, eleven lines. The nations now are beginning to feel the effects of Yahweh's fury. In anger he threshes the nations. He goes forth for the salvation of his anointed. We have several variations from the regular movement here: line 3, v. 13; lines 1 and 3 v. 14.

The seventh strophe is found in v. 16, six lines. Here the movement throughout is trimeter except in line 4, where it is dimeter. This strophe shows the effect of Yahweh's manifestation upon the poet himself and his people.

The eighth strophe is found in vv. 17, 18, 19, eleven lines and a subscription which seems to be a musical direction. Here we have an expression of triumphant faith. Though all nature should fail them in bringing forth the sustenance they need, the poet will trust in Yahweh who is their sure defense.

The seventh strophe is found in v. 16, six lines. Here the movement throughout is trimeter except in line 4, where it is dimeter. This strophe shows the effect of Yahweh's manifestation upon the poet himself and his people.

The eighth strophe is found in vv. 17, 18, 19, eleven lines and a subscription which seems to be a musical direction. Here we have an expression of triumphant faith. Though all nature should fail them in bringing forth the sustenance they need, the poet will trust in Yahweh who is their sure defense.

V. THE PLACE OF HABAKKUK IN THE HISTORY OF HEBREW THOUGHT.

V. THE PLACE OF JAPANESE IN THE HISTORY OF HUMAN THOUGHT.

Thus far, our main concern, in the study of the book of Habakkuk, has been in questions of literary and historical criticism; and while these are very important, and have great value for a thorough understanding of the book, any treatment which only took these phases of the book into consideration would be wholly inadequate to meet the needs of the situation.

The Hebrew prophet was not merely a student and writer, in the ordinary conception of that term, he was Yahweh's spokesman in the world. In his times, he was the living, human link between Yahweh and his "chosen people". It was the prophet's privilege, no less than his duty, to "cast up a highway" for his people, in order that he might make easy their approach to their God.

If one would know fully the story of Israel's religious development from the beginning of her history until its close, he must needs study the history of prophecy in Israel. The prophets were ever in the van of Israel's religious progress. Each of the prophets made his own distinct and unique contribution to this religious development.

It will be the aim of this section to set forth, at some length, Habakkuk's most valuable contributions to the theological thinking of his times.

1. The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament and Habakkuk's Contribution to it.

In early times suffering was looked upon as a penalty for sin. This was not only true in Israel, but among other ancient

Thus far, our main concern, in the study of the book of Habakkuk, has been in questions of literary and historical criticism; and while these are very important, and have great value for a thorough understanding of the book, any treatment which only took these phases of the book into consideration would be wholly inadequate to meet the needs of the situation.

The Hebrew prophet was not merely a student and writer, in the ordinary conception of that term, he was Yahweh's spokesman in the world. In his times, he was the living, human link between Yahweh and his "chosen people". It was the prophet's privilege, no less than his duty, to "cast up a highway" for his people, in order that he might make easy their approach to their God.

If one would know fully the story of Israel's religious development from the beginning of her history until its close, he must needs study the history of prophecy in Israel. The prophets were ever in the van of Israel's religious progress. Each of the prophets made his own distinct and unique contribution to this religious development.

It will be the aim of this section to set forth, at some length, Habakkuk's most valuable contributions to the theological thinking of his times.

I. The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament and Habakkuk's Contribution to It.

In early times suffering was looked upon as a penalty for sin. This was not only true in Israel, but among other ancient

peoples also. Among some of these ancient peoples the view obtained that mankind was just a puppet of the gods; that when misfortune came it was not necessarily a sign of sin, but was due to the caprice of some angered Deity. However, the view in early Israel was that Jehovah was angered by some sin committed, and showed his anger by bringing suffering upon the sinner.

One of the earliest statements of this view of suffering is that given in J's account of creation (Gen. 2:4b-3:24). In ch. 3, especially, the author of the narrative gives an extended account of the origin of suffering. The woman was beguiled by the serpent, and she in turn tempted the man, and both ate of the forbidden fruit and were now paying the penalty for their disobedience. The man must earn his living by the sweat of his brow; the woman must bear the pangs of child-birth; the serpent must crawl upon his belly in the dust and be the constant victim of man's enmity. Indeed, we get the impression that death itself might have been avoided if man had not sinned.

As to the character of the sin, it might vary greatly. It might be ceremonial as in the case of the sin of Israel spoken of in 1 Sam. 14: 31-35, where the people were said to have sinned because they ate the meat of their slain animals with the blood. On the other hand, it might be distinctly ethical, as in the case of Ahab's appropriation of Naboth's vineyard to himself (1 Kings 21). It might be intentional, as in the case of David's sin against Uriah (2 Sam. 11); or unintentional, as in the case of Jonathan's eating the honey when the order had been given that no honey be eaten (1 Sam. 14:27, 43).

The point to be kept in mind is that in early Israel

suffering was regarded as a penalty for sin.

The Eighth Century Prophets.

Nor did the eighth century prophets take a fundamentally different view ~~on~~ of the subject. Their contribution was in the matter of insistence upon the primacy of the ethical over the ceremonial. Note the wonderful outburst of Amos in ch. 5:21-24: "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies.....but let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream." Hosea follows in much the same vein in ch. 6:6; and Isaiah is, if anything, more bitter in 1:10-17, in his denunciation of external ceremonialism, and in his demand for higher ethical standards. And Micah (6:8) sums up, in a beautiful way, the view of the eighth century prophets as to Jehovah's requirements. But all of them insisted that Israel was doomed because of her sins. She was bound to suffer as a penalty for her sins.

The writer of Deuteronomy took much the same view as the eighth century prophets except that he placed more emphasis on ceremonialism than did they. He emphasized national prosperity as the reward of faithfulness to Jehovah (Deut. 28:1-4).

A Change in the Conception of Suffering.

Thus far we have noticed that while the eighth century prophets in particular made an important contribution to the problem of suffering in the fact that they insisted upon putting more emphasis on ethical transgressions than upon those of a ceremonial character, there was still very general agreement that suffering was the penalty for sin. However, during the period

suffering was regarded as a penalty for sin.

The Eighth Century Prophets.

Nor did the eighth century prophets take a fundamentally different view of the subject. Their contribution was in the matter of insistence upon the primacy of the ethical over the ceremonial. Note the wonderful outburst of Amos in ch. 5:21-24: "I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies.....But let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream." Hosea follows in much the same vein in ch. 6:6; and Isaiah is, if anything, more bitter in 1:10-17, in his denunciation of external ceremonialism, and in his demand for higher ethical standards. And Micah (6:8) sums up, in a beautiful way, the view of the eighth century prophets as to Jehovah's requirements. But all of them insisted that Israel was doomed because of her sins. She was bound to suffer as a penalty for her sins.

The writer of Deuteronomy took much the same view as the eighth century prophets except that he placed more emphasis on ceremonialism than did they. He emphasized national prosperity as the reward of faithfulness to Jehovah (Deut. 28:1-4).

A Change in the Conception of Suffering.

Thus far we have noticed that while the eighth century prophets in particular made an important contribution to the problem of suffering in the fact that they insisted upon putting more emphasis on ethical transgressions than upon those of a ceremonial character, there was still very general agreement that suffering was the penalty for sin. However, during the period

embracing the reign of Josiah, and later, we note a change in the conception of suffering on the part of the writers of that period. This is usually attributed to two things: "The Deutronomic Reformation 621 B. C.; and "The growth of individualism."

The burden of the plea of the eighth century prophets was that Israel's only hope of escaping the inevitable doom that awaited her was to make herself a righteous nation. This her statesmen strove to do, and felt they had very largely succeeded in doing by putting into effect the Deutronomic reforms. However, instead of averting the predicted doom, their righteous king Josiah was slain at Megiddo, (608 B. C.) in an effort to keep the invading Egyptions under Necho from crossing his territory.

Nor did their calamities end here. Jehoahaz, the successor to Josiah, was deposed, after three months and taken to Egypt to die. Jehoiachin was carried a captive to Babylon in 597 B. C.; and finally Jerusalem itself was captured in 586 B.C., and the best of the population taken down into Babylon for a long period of captivity.

These circumstances inevitably reacted upon their view of suffering, and doubtless upon their theology generally. No more could they view suffering simply as a penalty for sin. A new apologetic must be written for the Yahweh religion; a new philosophy for suffering must be set forth.

The first to sound this new note was Jeremiah. He was not surprised at Judah's sufferings, because Judah had sinned, and it was to be expected that she would pay the penalty for her sin.

But there were some things about Yahweh's dealings that were enigmatical to him. However, his problems are mainly personal. The first of these problems he raises in ch. 12:1-3, where he wants to know why the wicked prosper and the righteous suffer; but immediately he drops it as too difficult of solution for him. Again he wants to know why Jehovah should choose him to be a "laughing-stock" and "derision", and then like a "deceitful brook" should fail him. However, he concludes that fellowship with Jehovah is worth all the anguish and misery necessary to attain such fellowship.

Jeremiah made an important contribution to the problem of suffering. As Professor Knudson observes (Religious Teaching of the O. T. p. 281): "He showed by his own experience not only that suffering was not inconsistent with fellowship with God, but that in the light of this fellowship no ground could be felt for complaint against the divine justice."

It was not possible for Ezekiel to deal with this problem in the subjective and individual way followed by Jeremiah. With the fall of Jerusalem the problem had become a burning national issue. Some were ascribing their misfortune to their too exclusive worship of Yahweh (Jer. 44:17-19). They were discouraged and disposed to resent this treatment on the part of Yahweh. Their resentment against Yahweh was expressed in Jer. 31:29 and Ezek. 18:2, in the words of the proverb: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." While the Jews believed this to be the explanation of their suffering, it did not square with their sense of justice.

Ezekiel was not interested in the matter of reconciling

But there were some things about Yahweh's dealings that were enigmatical to him. However, his problems are mainly personal. The first of these problems he raises in ch. 12:1-5, where he wants to know why the wicked prosper and the righteous suffer; but immediately he drops it as too difficult of solution for him. Again he wants to know why Jehovah should choose him to be a "laughing-stock" and "derision", and then like a "deceitful brook" should fail him. However, he concludes that fellowship with Jehovah is worth all the anguish and misery necessary to attain such fellowship.

Jeremiah made an important contribution to the problem of suffering. As Professor Knudson observes (Religious Teaching of the O. T. p. 281): "He showed by his own experience not only that suffering was not inconsistent with fellowship with God, but that in the light of this fellowship no ground could be felt for complaint against the divine justice."

It was not possible for Ezekiel to deal with this problem in the subjective and individual way followed by Jeremiah. With the fall of Jerusalem the problem had become a burning national issue. Some were ascribing their misfortune to their too exclusive worship of Yahweh (Jer. 44:17-19). They were discouraged and disposed to resent this treatment on the part of Yahweh. Their resentment against Yahweh was expressed in Jer. 31:29 and Ezek. 18:2, in the words of the proverb: "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." While the Jews believed this to be the explanation of their suffering, it did not square with their sense of justice.

Ezekiel was not interested in the matter of reconciling

the hard fate of Judah with justice, he was only interested in clearing the fair name of Yahweh from the aspersions cast upon it. His idea is always to vindicate Yahweh. Said he, there is no such thing as vicarious suffering. "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (Ezek. 18:20).

Ezekiel was not surprised that Israel was being punished; he was rather surprised that her punishment had been deferred so long. This was to be accounted for , not on the basis of Yahweh's compassion for Israel, but left his reputation be lowered among the heathen on account of his inability to protect his chosen people. It was this same desire to vindicate his holy name that would cause Yahweh to restore Israel.

Deutero-Isaiah and Job.

The fall of Jerusalem raised doubts in many minds as to the correctness of the traditional view of suffering. With the question raised as to the justiœ of the treatment accorded Israel in the punishment she was receiving, came the opportunity and inspiration to more elaborate attempts at a solution of the problem. In response to this demand there was produced two of the greatest writers on the subject. These were the unknown author of ch. 40-66 of the Book of Isaiah--who for the want of a better name is known as Deutero-Isaiah--and the author of the Book of Job.

Deutero-Isaiah lived near the close of the exile. His great concern was the suffering of Israel as a nation. He

the hard fate of Judah with justice, he was only interested in clearing the fair name of Yahweh from the aspersions cast upon it. His idea is always to vindicate Yahweh. Sola he, there is no such thing as vicarious suffering. "The soul that sinneth it shall die. The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall father bear the iniquity of the son; the righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (Ezek. 18:20).

Ezekiel was not surprised that Israel was being punished; he was rather surprised that her punishment had been deferred so long. This was to be accounted for, not on the basis of Yahweh's compassion for Israel, but left his reputation be lowered among the nations on account of his inability to protect his chosen people. It was this same desire to vindicate his holy name that would cause Yahweh to restore Israel.

Deutero-Isaiah and Job.

The fall of Jerusalem raised doubts in many minds as to the correctness of the traditional view of suffering. With the question raised as to the justice of the treatment accorded Israel in the punishment she was receiving, came the opportunity and inspiration to more elaborate attempts at a solution of the problem. In response to this demand there was produced two of the greatest writers on the subject. These were the unknown author of ch. 40-55 of the Book of Isaiah--who for the want of a better name is known as Deutero-Isaiah--and the author of the Book of Job.

Deutero-Isaiah lived near the close of the exile. His great concern was the suffering of Israel as a nation. He

begins his prophecy with the statement, "Comfort, comfort ye my people, saith your God." He speaks constantly of the suffering servant and the character of his work. There are those like A. S. Peake (Problem of Suffering) who think he has the whole nation in mind when he speaks of the suffering servant. Others think he has reference to an ideal Individual. But whichever view we adopt does not affect the point we are considering. It was Deutero-Isaiah's view that not only were the sufferings of servant undeserved, but he was actually suffering for others. Accepting Peake's view that Israel was the figure he referred to in the term "Suffering Servant," the prophet would say of her as follows: Israel has suffered terribly; but for the most part her suffering was undeserved. The only explanation adequate for the rest of her sufferings was that they were vicarious and redemptive ("He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed." Isa. 53:5).

Israel's exile did not mean that she was out of favor with Yahweh, but that Yahweh was using this means to teach the world the Yahweh religion. By Israel's stripes the rest of mankind was to be healed.

As Professor Knudson says (Religious Teaching of the Old Testament, p. 284) "No deeper or higher thought concerning suffering is anywhere to be found."

The most elaborate discussion of this problem is to be found in the book of Job. The date of the book is uncertain but the consensus of opinion among scholars is that it was at least a century after the time of Deutero-Isaiah.

The Book of Job consists of five parts: (1) The Prologue (chs. 1-2); (2) The Colloquies between Job and his three friends (chs. 3-31); (3) The Discourse of Elihu (chs. 32-37); (4) Jehovah's reply to Job (chs. 38:1-42-6); (5) the Epilogue (chs. 42:7-17).

Several views are herein given as an explanation of suffering. In the prologue, the hero Job is described as a perfect and upright man. Satan asks permission of Jehovah to test him by means of affliction. Permission is given and one affliction after another is imposed upon him. His property is taken, his children perish; and he himself is afflicted with a loathsome disease.

Here is the implicit suggestion that suffering is heaven's test of goodness.

In the second section (chs. 3-31), we are given the benefit of the debates between Job and his three friends on the "why" of his suffering. His friends accept the old traditional view that suffering is a penalty for sin. Since Job is a sufferer he must have sinned. To this view Job objects very vigorously. He continues to assert his innocense and is certain of ultimate vindication sometime, somewhere (ch. 19:25-27).

Here we have two explanations of suffering--the old traditional view that suffering is the penalty for sin, and the view of Job, that much of suffering is undeserved, and that there will ultimately be vindication for the sufferer.

In the third section (chs. 32-37), we have the discourse of one of the bystanders, Elihu. He differs with both Job and his friends, and expresses the view that suffering has a disciplinary value--it is one of the voices by which God warns and restores

The Book of Job consists of five parts: (1) The Prologue (chs. 1-2); (2) The Colloquies between Job and his three Friends (chs. 3-31); (3) The Discourses of Elihu (chs. 32-37); (4) Jehovah's reply to Job (chs. 38:1-42:6); (5) the Epilogue (chs. 42:7-17).

Several views are herein given as an explanation of suffering. In the prologue, the hero Job is described as a perfect and upright man. Satan asks permission of Jehovah to test him by means of affliction. Permission is given and one affliction after another is imposed upon him. His property is taken, his children perish; and he himself is afflicted with a loathsome disease. Here is the implicit suggestion that suffering is heaven's test of goodness.

In the second section (chs. 3-31), we are given the benefit of the debates between Job and his three Friends on the "why" of his suffering. His friends accept the old traditional view that suffering is a penalty for sin. Since Job is a sufferer he must have sinned. To this view Job objects very vigorously. He continues to assert his innocence and is certain of ultimate vindication sometime, somewhere (ch. 19:25-27).

Here we have two explanations of suffering--the old traditional view that suffering is the penalty for sin, and the view of Job, that much of suffering is undeserved, and that there will ultimately be vindication for the sufferer.

In the third section (chs. 32-37), we have the discourse of one of the bystanders, Elihu. He differs with both Job and his friends, and expresses the view that suffering has a disciplinary value--it is one of the voices by which God warns and restores

men.

And finally in chs. 38f., we are told that the whole universe is an unfathomable mystery in which evil is not more mysterious than good.

But Job's discussion, elaborate and full as it was, did not solve the problem; and so it continued to be the subject of discussion by other writers who followed him. Particularly is this true of the Psalms. Take the 37th for example. Here the author enjoins his readers not to worry because of evil-doers, because the wicked were soon to be "cut down like the grass, and wither as the green herb". On the other hand, the righteous were to dwell in the land, and delight themselves in their faithfulness.

In some ways the highest conception in the solution of this problem, found in the Old Testament, is that found in Psalm 73. Here the Psalmist has been troubled about the prosperity of the wicked. They are not in trouble as other men. They have more than heart can wish and increase in riches.

The Psalmist's thoughts in this connection had been exceedingly painful for him until by faith he gets a full glimpse of his own wealth in God. Earth recedes, heaven approaches, and the veil is lifted. For a few moments he is permitted to commune directly with his God. Then he realizes how immeasurably superior to the wicked is his lot. Listen as he sings: "Nevertheless I am continually with thee: Thou hast holden up my right hand. Thou wilt guide me with thy counsel, and afterward receive me to glory. Whom Have I in heaven but thee?

And there is none upon earth that I desire beside thee: My flesh and my heart faileth; but God is the strength of my heart and my portion forever."

Prof. Humbert in an article in the "Biblical World," Sept. 1918, says of this Psalm: "The soul partakes of the divine mysteries of a mystic communion and rises to an immovable assurance of the faith that lifts up mountains, even the mountains of pain. It is no more, as in Job, the struggle to grasp God; it is the full possession of God and supreme peace in this possession."

The old Hebrews did not solve the problem of suffering, nor have we. In the last analysis any hope for its solution, so far as we can see at present, must rest upon our faith in Jesus and his promises for the hereafter.

Habakkuk's Contribution to the Problem of Suffering.

The question now arises as to Habakkuk's contribution to the problem of suffering.

The fall of Jerusalem was doubtless responsible for the prophecy of the practically unknown prophet, Habakkuk. He seems to have been a contemporary of Ezekiel, and both were younger contemporaries of Jeremiah.

Just as the fall of Jerusalem made it necessary for Ezekiel, who was among the exiles in Babylon, to address himself to a solution of this new phase of the problem of suffering; in the same way, Habakkuk, who probably lived in Palestine, was called upon to give a solution of the problem. Further, he must give words of comfort to his fellow-sufferers in the homeland.

His method of approach to the subject is diametrically opposed to that of Ezekiel. He does not set as his first and foremost objective, the vindication of Yahweh, but demands that Yahweh vindicate himself. With him Yahweh is on trial and he waits to see what answer He will return to his prophet (ch. 2:1). Nor does he put all the stress on Israel's sin as Ezekiel was wont to do. He dares to sound a new note in this problem. While duly conscious of Israel's sin, he is not convinced that their suffering is altogether the result of their sin. If this were true how does it happen that they who were raised up to punish Israel for their sins, were more wicked than those whom they would punish? He dared to question the justice of such treatment. In this he was the people's tribune, the great commoner, the one who interpreted the questionings of the masses of the suffering in Israel, who at this time were like sheep without a shepherd. Nor did he question in vain. In answer to his query there came a reply that, while it did not settle mathematically the problem of suffering, was a great source of comfort to those who waited on his message and were in sore need of it; and as well, a source of comfort to those who have lived since his day. It was to this effect: The righteous in Israel need not have any fear because their country had been overrun by a powerful but wicked enemy. This triumph was only temporary. The root of the downfall of these haughty conquerors was in themselves. Only the righteous people would live ultimately, and this because of their faith.

As Professor Knudson says (Religious Teaching of the O. T. p. 279) Habakkuk's book marked "The beginning of speculation in

Israel." In that consisted its chief significance. He was the first who really dared to question the traditional view that suffering was the result of sin. His answer was, as we have seen, that the righteous would ultimately triumph, and the wicked just as surely perish. This solution did not constitute much of an advance, and certainly was not the final word on the subject, but it paved the way for other and more elaborate attempts at a solution of this most difficult and baffling problem.

2. The Apocalyptic Hope in the Old Testament--Habakkuk's Contribution To It.

One of the things most evident in the Old Testament is the belief everywhere that better days are coming for Yahweh's chosen people; and especially is this hope for the nation pronounced. Not only is this to be noted in what may be called Israel's formal history, beginning with Moses and the Exodus, but intimations of that better day are to be seen in that period known as the Patriarchal period. Note the promise made to Abraham (Gen. 12:3): "In thee shall all families of the earth be blessed."

This note is continued in the preprophetic period as may be seen from the "Blessing of Jacob" (Gen. 49) and the "Blessing" of Moses" (Deut. 33). In his last charge to the people (Deut. 32) Moses suggests that if they keep the law of Jehovah, they will capture the land from their enemies and will prolong their days in it.

Perhaps, nothing was more indicative of the hope that would not die in Israel than their ancient benediction found in Num. 6: 24-26, and chanted daily by their priests from the steps of the

temple (Robinson, Religious Ideas of O. T. p. 184).

"Jehovah bless thee and keep thee:
Jehovah make his face to shine upon thee;
And be gracious unto thee;
Jehovah lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace."

Every time this was said, they reminded themselves and the people generally of their firm faith that Yahweh would ultimately bring the choicest blessings to his people. Israel's hope of the future appeared in various forms, one of the most prominent being the "Day of Yahweh".

The Day of Yahweh.

By the 8th century B. C. there had grown up a popular belief in what had come to be known as the "Day of Yahweh". According to this view there was to come suddenly a day when Yahweh, Israel's great king, would intervene in the world in behalf of his people, Israel. In that day all Israel's enemies would be overcome, and Israel would be supreme among the nations.

Amos, the first of the literary prophets, criticised this popular belief. While he shared in the view that there would come the "Day of Yahweh", his interpretation was entirely different from the popular view. There was to be a day of Yahweh, but it would be a day of darkness rather than light. Not only the other nations, but Israel was well would be doomed, because of her sins (ch. 5:18).

From the time of Amos this phrase and doctrine became a central idea in the utterances of the prophets. By them it is interpreted to mean the day in which Yahweh will reveal himself

fully and completely to the world as its moral Governor.

There seems to have been three stages in this idea of the "Day of Yahweh": (a) The view of the pre-exilic prophets. These prophets thought of the day of Yahweh primarily as the time when Yahweh would punish Israel for her sins, though other nations would be included also. Note the view of Amos (3:2): "You only Have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." Note also Hosea 4:3 and 2:18f.

One of the most interesting of the prophets in this connection is Zephaniah who lived about a century after Amos. He represented the day of Yahweh as near at hand. It was a day of trouble and desolation. All the nations were to be assembled, and Yahweh's wrath was to be poured out on all the kingdoms; and all the earth was to be devoured with the fire of his jealousy (chs. 1:14-18; 3:8).

In the view of most modern scholars, it was Zephaniah who was responsible for the view in Israel which obtained down to the New Testament times, that there would come upon the world a judgment world-wide in scope. Before his time it was local and political; utterly without any eschatological significance. But to this view Professor Knudson(Religious Teaching of the O. T. p. 359f.) objects, and, as we think, with good reason. He thinks such an advance step could hardly have been taken by a man, who in no other regard, showed any capacity for constructive thought. He argues, further, that if the idea had been original with Zephaniah, he would have presented it in a concrete form as, for instance, a world-flood or fire. Zephaniah, however, seems to be

fully and completely to the world as its moral Governor.

There seems to have been three stages in this idea of the "Day of Yahweh": (a) The view of the pre-exilic prophets. These prophets thought of the day of Yahweh primarily as the time when Yahweh would punish Israel for her sins, though other nations would be included also. Note the view of Amos (3:2): "You only have I known of all the families of the earth; therefore I will visit upon you all your iniquities." Note also Hosea 4:3 and 2:18f.

One of the most interesting of the prophets in this connection is Zephaniah who lived about a century after Amos. He represented the day of Yahweh as near at hand. It was a day of trouble and desolation. All the nations were to be assembled, and Yahweh's wrath was to be poured out on all the kingdoms; and all the earth was to be devoured with the fire of his jealousy (cha. 1:14-18; 3:8).

In the view of most modern scholars, it was Zephaniah who was responsible for the view in Israel which obtained down to the New Testament times, that there would come upon the world a judgment world-wide in scope. Before his time it was local and political; utterly without any eschatological significance. But to this view Professor Knudson(Religious Teaching of the O. T. p. 350f.) objects, and, as we think, with good reason. He thinks such an advance step could hardly have been taken by a man, who in no other regard, showed any capacity for constructive thought. He argues, further, that if the idea had been original with Zephaniah, he would have presented it in a concrete form as, for instance, a world-flood or fire. Zephaniah, however, seems to be

dealing with traditional material.

As matter of fact, this idea of doom to the world seems to have come from an early period in Israel's history, and perhaps antedated its history.

In the view of the earlier prophets, the "Day of Yahweh" was to mean exile to Israel. That is to say, in bringing about Israel's downfall, Yahweh would reveal himself as a righteous Deity, absolutely determined to see that the ends of justice were served.

(b) The view of the Exilic writers.

With the coming of the Exile the judgment on Israel seems to have been fulfilled, and during the Exile, and at the period of the Restoration, the judgment of the day of Yahweh is spoken of as being visited upon the heathen world. For example, Isa. 13, written about 555 B. C., represents Yahweh as being angry with Babylon, and as planning to use the Medes as his instrument of punishment.

Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 44ff) awaits a day in which Yahweh will reveal himself in gracious deliverance of his people from Babylon. Haggai (2:6f) speaks of a time when Yahweh will shake the heavens, and the earth, and the dry land, and all nations, and fill the temple at Jerusalem with his glory. In that day all the kingdoms of the nations shall be overthrown. This same idea is expressed in Zechariah (chs. 1-8). In Zech. 14 it is asserted that the nations will gather for an attack on Jerusalem, but Yahweh will make an escape for his people through a cleft in the mount of Olives. Ultimately Yahweh will be king over all the earth, and Jerusalem will be the city of his

habitation. We find the same note in Psalms 93-99.

(c) The third stage was after Israel was restored, and was falling into sin again. The prophets had to warn her again of the coming of the day of Yahweh as in the case of Malachi (3:2f;4:5f). He reminds his hearers that when Yahweh comes he will be like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap. His task will be to purge Judah and make of her a righteous nation.

The Coming of the Ideal Kingdom.

Another form under which Israel's hope of the future expressed itself was in the view of the ideal kingdom that was to be established at Jerusalem.

In the preceding section we called attention to the popular tradition prevalent during the time of Amos that the "day of Yahweh" would be the day on which Yahweh would avenge himself on all Israel's enemies. On this day all these nations would be destroyed, and Israel would be supreme.

This tradition had its origin and inspiration in Israel's conception of Yahweh's relation to her remarkable history. Early in their history Yahweh had led them out of Egypt by the hand of Moses; established them in Canaan despite the protests of the tribes who inhabited the land; and had raised them to power and prestige under David and Solomon.

In later years, this period embracing David's reign came to be regarded as the golden age of the nation's history, and, when misfortune came to them, they longed, hoped, and prayed for, the return of their ideal kingdom. As Peters (The Religion of Hebrews, p. 429) so accurately observes: It was really not David

habitation. We find the same note in Psalms 93-99.

(c) The third stage was after Israel was restored, and was falling into sin again. The prophets had to warn her again of the coming of the day of Yahweh as in the case of Malachi (3:2f; 4:5f). He reminds his hearers that when Yahweh comes he will be like a refiner's fire and like fuller's soap. His task will be to purge Judah and make of her a righteous nation.

The Coming of the Ideal Kingdom.

Another form under which Israel's hope of the future expressed itself was in the view of the ideal Kingdom that was to be established at Jerusalem.

In the preceding section we called attention to the popular tradition prevalent during the time of Amos that the "day of Yahweh" would be the day on which Yahweh would avenge himself on all Israel's enemies. On this day all these nations would be destroyed, and Israel would be supreme.

This tradition had its origin and inspiration in Israel's conception of Yahweh's relation to her remarkable history. Early in their history Yahweh had led them out of Egypt by the hand of Moses; established them in Canaan despite the protests of the tribes who inhabited the land; and had raised them to power and prestige under David and Solomon.

In later years, this period embracing David's reign came to be regarded as the golden age of the nation's history, and, when misfortune came to them, they longed, hoped, and prayed for the return of their ideal kingdom. As Peters (The Religion of Hebrews, p. 429) so accurately observes: It was really not David

they longed for, but the kingdom and glory of David. What they did was to actually idealize the Davidic kingdom of the past and make it the complete embodiment of what they hoped the day of Yahweh would really mean to them. As an evidence of this popular view note the words of Nathan to David in 2 Sam. 7:5-16. In v. 18 we have the following: "And thy house and thy kingdom shall be made sure before thee: thy throne shall be established forever."

As we have said above, the prophets took note of this tradition and belief. More, they interpreted it, especially that part pertaining to the "day of Yahweh", differently from what the people usually understood it to mean. But they never rejected it entirely. According to them the nation must suffer terribly for all her sins, but, after she was purged, a glorious future awaited her.

For example, no prophet was more stern than Amos in his denunciation of Israel's sins, and his prediction of certain doom that awaited her because of her sins; and yet even he seems to realize that this judgment is not eternal. In ch. 9:8-9 he says: "Behold, the eyes of the Lord Jehovah are upon the sinful kingdoms, and I will destroy it from the face of the earth; save that I will not utterly destroy the house of Jacob, saith Jehovah. For lo, I will command, and I will sift the house of Israel among all the nations, like as grain is sifted in a sieve, yet shall not the least kernel fall upon the earth". We are not unmindful of the fact that the above verses are regarded by many scholars as having been added by a later hand but their reasons are not convincing to us.

Then note Hosea's words of hope in ch. 2:14f: "Therefore, behold, I will allure her, and bring her into the wilderness, and

speak comfortably unto her. And I will give her her vineyards from thence, and the valley of Achor for a door of hope; and she shall make answer there as in the days of her youth."

But it is in Isaiah that we have the most beautiful and thrilling expressions of this hope of an ideal kingdom. Note ch. 1:26: "And I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy counsellors as at the beginning: Afterward thou shalt be called the city of righteousness, a faithful town." Again, note that beautiful passage in ch. 2:2-4 (found also in Mic. 4:1-3): "And it shall come to pass in the latter days, that the mountain of Jehovah's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it, etc."
Other such passages are found in chs. 4:2-6; 9:1-6; 11:1-10.

Jeremiah (chs. 30, 31; 23ff) also writes of the new day that would come to Israel after the captivity. In ch. 17:25 we read: "Then shall there enter in by the gates of this city kings and princes sitting upon the throne of David, riding in chariots and on horses, they and their princes, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem; and this city shall remain forever."

Haggai and Zechariah look forward to the speedy fulfillment of the old national hope. With a new temple erected, Yahweh would shake the heavens and the earth and all the nations, and would enable them to secure the precious things of all the nations; and would fill his house, the temple, with glory (Hag. 2:6-8).

One of the most remarkable expressions of this new day to which they are urged to look forward is found in the writings of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 65:17f). Here the prophet speaks of the

creation of new heavens and a new earth; and a Jerusalem that shall never again know sorrow.

All these are indicative of the undying hope in Israel that better days were coming for the "chosen of God".

The Personal Messiah.

Still another form under which this national hope expressed itself was in the belief in the coming of a personal Messiah. As in the case of the "day of Yahweh", there seems to have come down from very early times a belief in Israel, that in time a Messiah would come. Note Gen. 49:10-12: "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler's staff from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the obdience of the people be etc."

This traditional conception was taken account of by the prophets in their view of the Messianic kingdom. In this connection there are three outstanding passages: Isa. 9:1-6; 11:1-5; Zech. 9:9. In the first passgae the Messiah is described as a wonderful child, upon whose shoulders the government would be placed. His name would be called Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace. There would be no end to the increase of his government and he would uphold the kingdom of David with justice and righteousness. In the second passage it is declared that the spirit of Yahweh shall rest upon him, and he shall judge with righteousness the poor, and with equity the meek of the earth. In the third passage, Jerusalem is told to rejoice at the coming of her king. He rides no war-horse, but comes to bring peace.

Thus far our study of the personal Messiah has been in his guise as the ideal king. Perhaps his most remarkable representation is in the character of "the Suffering Servant". There has been some question here as to whether Israel as a nation is meant here, or some ideal Individual. As Professor Knudson says (Religious Teachings of O. T. p. 375), it is not a matter of any special importance whether He is understood as an Individual or in a collective sense. It is sufficient for our present discussion that he be recognized as the agent through whom mankind was to be saved. And how beautifully his sufferings are described: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; and the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53:4-5).

Another figure used to describe the personal Messiah was "Son of man". This representation is found in the book of Daniel (ch. 7:13f).

But whether we find the Messiah represented as the Ideal King, the Suffering Servant, or the Son of Man, it is all a part of that larger conception that better days are coming for Israel, Yahweh's chosen people. It was this conviction that gave them comfort in their times of trial, and nerved them for all the coming days.

Habakkuk's Contribution to the Apocalyptic Hope.

The question now arises as to Habakkuk's contribution to Israel's Apocalyptic hope. Neither his ministry nor his prophecy was a long one. There was not the opportunity, afforded a

Thus far our study of the personal Messiah has been in his guise as the ideal king. Perhaps his most remarkable representation is the character of "the Suffering Servant". There has been some question here as to whether Israel as a nation is meant here, or some ideal individual. As Professor Knudson says (Religious Teachings of O. T. p. 273), it is not a matter of any special importance whether He is understood as an individual or in a collective sense. It is sufficient for our present discussion that he be recognized as the agent through whom mankind was to be saved. And how beautifully his sufferings are described: "Surely he hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; yet we did esteem him stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted. But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; and the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed" (Isa. 53:4-5).

Another figure used to describe the personal Messiah was "Son of man". This representation is found in this book of Daniel (ch. 7:13f).

But whether we find the Messiah represented as the Ideal King, the Suffering Servant, or the Son of Man, it is all a part of that larger conception that better days are coming for Israel, Yahweh's chosen people. It was this conviction that gave them comfort in their times of trial, and nerved them for all the coming days.

Habakkuk's Contribution to the Apocalyptic Hope.

The question now arises as to Habakkuk's contribution to Israel's Apocalyptic hope. Neither his ministry nor his prophecy was a long one. There was not the opportunity, afforded a

prophet who wrote at much greater length, to develop anything resembling a system of theology. There was just one impulse which moved him to phophesy, and thatwas to give comfort to his people.

The particular phase of the Apocalyptic hope which engaged his attention may be said to be the "day of Yahweh". As we noted in our discussion of the "Day of Yahweh", there were three stages in its development: (1) That by the pre-exilic prophets, to the effect that it would be a day when Yahweh would punish Israel for her sins; (2) The view of the prophets of the Exile, viz: that henceforth Yahweh's wrath would be visited upon the heathen; (3) The view of the prophets of the Restoration, to the effect that Yahweh will again purge Judah, which has again fallen into sin, after which her better days would come.

Habakkuk, who wrote in the period immediately following the Exile, and the fall of Jerusalem, was the leader of that group of Israel's prophets who predicted the downfall of Israel's enemies. He was not unmindful of Israel's sins. There was little question in his mind as to the justice of the punishment with which his nation had been visited; but Yahweh's wrath, as far as Israel was concerned, had spent itself. Henceforth it would be visited upon the haughty oppressor whose might was his god.

Standing on his watch-tower, he dares to question Yahweh himself as to what the future held for his people. Note the answer: "The vision is yet for the appointed time, and it hasteth toward the end and shall not lie; though it tarry wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not delay (ch.2:3)". That is to say, although the most terrible calamities had befallen the Jewish people, they need not think this was the "day of

Yahweh"; nor need their enemies think it. The "day of Yahweh" was yet to come. This day would be the day when righteousness would be exalted; when the proud and the haughty would be debased.

Then follows a severe excoriation of the marauders who were responsible for the bad plight of the Jews. These marauders were the Chaldeans. Nations that they had robbed would rise up suddenly and attack them, and they themselves would be plundered by their former victims.

Ultimately the cause of Yahweh would triumph; and the earth will be filled with the knowledge of the glory of Yahweh as the waters cover the sea.

Habakkuk's contribution to this problem in Israel's religious thinking, would seem to be considerable. Just as he was the first to question the traditional view with reference to the problem of suffering, he was among the first, if not the first, to set forth the view that the "day of Yahweh" was not the exile, which saw the downfall of Israel's hopes as a nation; instead, the "day of Yahweh" was yet to come, and it was to be a manifestation of Yahweh's power over a proud and haughty nation. Ultimately the Yahweh religion and Yahweh's will would be known and accepted over all the earth.

3. The Conception of God in the Old Testament and Habakkuk's Contribution to it.

We begin with a brief inquiry into the ancient Hebrew's conception of God.

First, it must be thought of as evolutionary and progres-

3. The Conception of God in the Old Testament and Mohammed's Contribution to It.

We begin with a brief inquiry into the ancient Hebrew's conception of God.

sive, starting from the low and crude conception held in common with the rest of their Semitic neighbors and attaining unto the lofty ethical conception set forth by the prophets.

(1) The view during the time of Moses.

There is reason to believe that the Hebrews were polytheists prior to the time of Moses. This is suggested by their plural name of God, ElOhim. However, from the time they accepted Jehovah as their God at Horeb-Sinai, they acknowledged no god except him.

It is not surprising, however, that they did not in this period have the highest conception of Yahweh their God. They thought of him as having great power. "The earth melts under his tread, and fire devours his adversaries." When he whispered the mountains shook, and people could not look on his face and live. And yet even here he was interested in Israel his chosen people. Because of his great love for them he did many marvelous things. He brought them out of Egypt and established them in Canaan. For this act of salvation on His part, He demands from them absolute fidelity. He gives them his law. They must have no other god before Him. They do not deny the existence of other gods, but insist that Jehovah is Israel's God, and Israel must serve him.

(2) The Period of Judges.

During this period the most that can be said for the Hebrew religion is their great faith in Jehovah their God. He had brought them out of bondage and was their hope of permanent

establishment in Canaan. He is still believed to reside on Sinai and to come from thence to fight for his people (Judges 5:4f); the earth still trembles and the mountain quakes at his presence. He was believed to be pleased at occasional sacrifices of human beings as is seen in the case of the sacrifice of Jepthah's daughter (Judges 11:34-40). He was responsible for Samson's great strength, but departed from him when his hair was cut. He also gave Samson more strength that he might wreak revenge upon the Phillistines.

(3) The Period of Monarchy.

The building of the temple at Jerusalem and the tendency toward a centralization of worship tended to make Israel think of Jehovah as the God of Israel, and ultimately as the God of the whole world. However, this view did not come at once as may be seen from David's words in I Sam. 26:19, where he complains about being driven out from the inheritance of Jehovah to serve other gods. There is the suggestion of an ethnic deity. Jehovah has jurisdiction only in Israel. This is seen also in Solomon's building not only a temple to his God, but temples to the gods of his wives as well.

(4) The Period of the Prophets.

During this period the conception of God reached its highest point of development, each prophet making some contribution to this development. At the close of the prophetic period, Jehovah had come to be recognized as a moral and spiritual Personality. He was the creator and sustainer of the universe, and had power over all nature. He was the God of history, who not only was

interested in the doings of mankind, but, in the long run, controlled them. This was not only true of Israel, but of other nations also. He was a God of righteousness and love, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy. He was the God of the whole earth, the only true God. He is the first and the last and can not give His glory to others.

Israel finally reached the plane of absolute Monotheism in her conception of Jehovah, but as was said above, this was not reached at once, nor by any one prophet, but was the results of the contributions of them all. For example, we have noted Moses' contribution, viz: Jehovah, alone was to be worshipped by Israel. This we call monolatry. It was Amos who first emphsized the ethical qualities of Jehovah. He was a God of morality and righteousnesss, rather than ceremonialism and external forms. Hosea emphasized his love; Isaiah his sovereignty, immanence and spirituality; and finally the high peak of absolute monotheism spoken of above, was reached by Deutero-Isaiah. Our problem in this study is to find the contribution made to the subject by Habakkuk.

Habakkuk's Idea of God.

God was from everlasting; He could not die. That is to say, He was not finite and mortal, but infinite and immortal. While the third chapter was pro-bably taken from the Psalter by a later editor or scribe, his description of Yahweh and his powers, doubtless, comports well with the conception of the average pious Jew's conception of God in Habakkuk's day. Here the author dwells at length on the majesty and power of Yahweh.

The very report of Yahweh brought down to the prophet through the years, made him afraid. Yahweh came from Teman. This suggested his wisdon and strength. His glory covered the heavens, and the earth was full of his praise. He was the all powerful, and all nature trembled at his tread. From beneath His feet went forth fiery bolts; he stood and measured the earth; he scattered the eternal mountains and caused the everlasting hills to bow, but His going forth was for the salvation of his anointed.

Yahweh was not only the God of Israel, but controlled in the affairs of the nations. It was not merely in Israel but among the nations that the raising up of the Chaldeans was causing consternation. Yahweh was working marvellously among them as well as in Israel. Moreover, it was Yahweh who was raising up the Chaldeans that bitter and hasty nation who were under the impression that their might was their god. When they had served his purpose for them he would cause them to perish.

And finally, Yahweh alone was God. All other objects by that name were simply the work of men's minds, dumb idols that had no life in them. More and more would men come to the view that Yahweh alone is God until the earth is full of the knowledge of his glory as the waters cover the sea.

While it cannot be claimed that Habakkuk made any particular contribution to the conception of God in his day, he was abreast of the highest conceptions of God of that period. He fully agreed with the view expressed earlier by Jeremiah that the gods of graven images were in reality no gods at all. There is also implicit in his teaching, both

the ideas of the righteousness of God, and His love; and, while he probably did not attain unto the conception of Deutero-Isaiah as to the absolute sovereignty of Yahweh over all nature, men, and nations, he, nevertheless, had a very advanced conception of Yahweh and His overlordship in the affairs of the world.

VI.

SUMMARY.

SUMMARY.

S U M M A R Y .

Almost nothing is known of Habakkuk's personal history. That he held a high place in the thought of the people of his day, and succeeding generations, is attested to, however, by the legendary material that has grown up around his name. Most of these traditions and legends, however, are so manifestly fantastic and unreliable that very little confidence can be placed in any of them.

Our difficulties do not end with the personal history of the prophet, but really increase as we examine some of the "problems" in the book itself. These problems are: The "Wicked" and "Righteous" in ch. 1:2-4; the relation of 1:5-11 to 1:2-4, especially as it concerns the Chaldeans; the identity of the "wicked" and "Righteous" in 1:13; the authenticity of 2:9-20 and ch. 3; and the date of the prophecy.

A careful survey of the field of Old Testament literature reveals the fact that few books in the Old Testament have been studied more exhaustively than has the book of Habakkuk. Scholars, both ancient and modern, have labored zealously to make clear the meaning of this unique little book. But while much labor has been expended, and, doubtless, considerable progress made toward the book's unfolding, there still remain many problems within the book, and concerning it, which have not yet been solved.

Prior to 1860 the traditional view, as to the authorship and unity of the book, was almost universally held. Beginning, however, with Von Gumpach in 1860, the tendency of modern critical scholarship has been to doubt the authenticity of the book as

SUMMARY

a whole, and to bring the dates of the several parts down to a much later period.

In this connection many different theories have been proposed as a solution for the problems found in the book. Stonehouse has made the following classification of these theories: (1) The Two-Oracle Theory; (2) The Fragmentary or Composite Theory; (3) The Reconstructive Theory; (4) The Redactional Theory; (5) The Interpretative Theory.

Von Gumpach was the father of the Two-Oracle theory. It was his view that the book was composed of two distinct prophecies; one predicting an invasion by the Scythians; the other, deliverance by the Chaldeans. He was followed in this hypothesis by De Goeji, a Dutch scholar in 1861; although De Goeji left it an open question as to the identity of the invading foe.

Gumpach and De Goeji's main contribution to the problem consisted in being the first to attempt a critical study of the book of Habakkuk.

The next to deal with the subject in any far-reaching way, was Giesebrecht, who, in 1890, gave notice of a rearrangement of the book. Giesebrecht asserted that 1:5-11 was not originally a part of the prophecy but was added later by the prophet, and placed before 1:1, as an introduction.

Giesebrecht's fundamental conclusions have been accepted, with individual modifications in each case, by Wellhausen, Nowack, and Peake.

The leading advocates of the Fragmentary theory are W. B. Stevenson and Karl Marti. While the views advanced by these two scholars are totally different, they, nevertheless, have one

thing in common; they would divide the book up into a number of segments, having little or no connection, either logically, or in a literary way, with each other. Neither hypothesis has been strongly supported by scholars.

The original and ablest exponent of the view, classified here as the "Reconstructive Theory", is Karl Budde. According to this view, the Assyrians were the oppressors referred to in ch. 1:2-4, and the Chaldeans were the liberators of Judah. Habakkuk's prophecy, in that case, is not directed against the Chaldeans, but against the Assyrians.

This view has had support with some reservations from a number of modern scholars, among whom are George Adam Smith, and A. Von Hoonacker.

As Davidson has pointed out, however, this view of Budde's, tho ably argued, is open to a number of serious criticisms, and is far from satisfactory.

The sponsor for the hypothesis known as the "Redactional Theory", was J. W. Rothstein. Rothstein claimed that chs. 1 and 2 were not originally arranged as at present, but came to their present arrangement through a considerable redactional process. Rothstein's hypothesis, however, while demonstrating the keen insight of the writer into the literary writings of prophetic times, has not been very convincing to modern scholarship. It gives the impression of being too elaborate for the ancient Hebrew editor.

The last general type or class of Hypotheses examined were those known as "Interpretative Theories". Here we find many and divers views expressed by as many different scholars.

First there is the view of Betterridge, who agrees with Budde that Assyria was the oppressor, rather than the Chaldeans, but holds to a much earlier date for the composition of the book, viz: 701 B. C. As a logical sequence of his view of the date of the prophecy, Betterridge insists that Habakkuk was an associate of Isaiah, the son of Amoz.

The same objections may be urged against Betterridge's "Assyrian" theory as was done in the case of Budde's argument, viz: if the Assyrians are meant, it is strange that nowhere in the book of Habakkuk are they mentioned. His view as to the date is not convincing.

A most unique view is that by Peiser, who holds that the book was written in Nineveh by a Jewish prince, probably the son or grandson of Manasseh, who had been taken to Nineveh as a hostage, and who aspired to the throne of his Jewish fathers.

This view of Peiser's is quite ingenious, but is too arbitrary to be regarded as even probable.

Doubtless one of the most radical views set forth in connection with the book of Habakkuk is that by Bernard Duhm. He thinks the book is composed of six distinct poems, all closely connected and treating of the same subject. They are written in well-constructed four-line pieces. The metre in all of these poems is perfectly regular. Wherever there is irregularity in the metre, that is an indication of "corrupt text", and the offending syllable, word, or group of words must be stricken from the text.

Another instance of Duhm's radical treatment of the text is seen in the method by which he arrives at the view that the

Greeks under Alexander the Great, rather than the Chaldeans, were the oppressors to whom Habakkuk referred. Duhm's hypothesis has not commended itself, to any large extent, to serious scholarship.

Other important views are those advocated by Happel, Lanterburg and Davidson.

Happel thinks the prophecy is meant to be eschatological, and was really written in post-exilic times. Although the Chaldeans are referred to, they are only a type of the powerful enemy who would rise up in the Messianic age.

Lanterburg takes the position that the Chaldeans are the oppressors and the Persians are the liberators of the Jews.

Neither of these theories has won the support among scholars.

The theory, that has had the largest following among scholars, is that by Davidson. Davidson thinks we have in ch. 1:2-4 a complaint regarding wrongs and injustices in Israel, after the manner of the ancient prophets. The oppressors are the more prosperous Jews, taking advantage of their weaker brethren. The Chaldeans are raised up to punish these injustices. The book was written, however, after the Chaldeans had been long on the stage of history. Ch. 1:5-11, therefore, where is found a prediction of the raising up the Chaldeans, is not a prophecy, "except in form. It is a reference to the past, an explanation merely of their presence and meaning as instruments of Jehovah."

Davidson himself, however, admits that this view of the book has something artificial about it; although such scholars as Driver, Orelli and Kirkpatrick have accepted his fundamental

conclusions.

And now for a brief summary of the writer's own conclusions touching the problems of the book of Habakkuk and the reasons for these conclusions.

Take it first in the question of the identity of the "wicked" and "righteous" in ch. 1:2-4. The most natural sense of the terms used in these verses would suggest that two classes among the Jews themselves were referred to. Such terms as "Torah" and Mishpat" were characteristic prophetic terminology, and would be intelligible only to a Jewish public, and only then when used with reference to other Jews.

The "wicked" then who "encompassed the righteous" and caused "justice to go forth perverted" were the more prosperous Jews who oppressed their less fortunate fellows. There is no necessity to confuse the terms "wicked" and "righteous" in 1:2-4 with those referred to in 1:13. In the latter case it is clear that the reference is to the haughty Chaldean tyrant, of whom it is implied in 1:5-11, that he was being raised up as an instrument of Yahweh to bring relief to the oppressed Jews. In 1:13, however, this Chaldean had become arrogant, because of his military successes, and is now accurately described by the prophet as, "The wicked" who "swalloweth up the man that is more righteous than he."

As to the problem raised by 1:5-11, it is the writer's view that these verses represent the reaction of the people of Judah to the coming of the Chaldeans, during the early stages of their advance into Palestine. Then they were looked upon as saviors, as Yahweh's instruments of justice.

The situation has now changed, however, and the prophet, writing after the capture and destruction of Jerusalem, is trying to comfort his people. The whole sweep of their relation to the Chaldeans passes before him. In these verses he reminds his countrymen of the high hopes placed by them in the rising up of the Chaldeans. At that time they seemed to be Yahweh's chosen instrument to bring justice, and freedom from oppression, to the oppressed Jews.

The prophet simply notes this in passing. This is not the "burden" of his prophecy. It comes later in his words to the effect that the haughty man shall perish, but the just shall live by his faith.

Now the prophet is simply giving them a bit of the history of their connection with the Chaldean to make more impressive his prophecy, a little later touching the destruction that is to come to these marauding people.

As to the authenticity of 2:9-20, there seems to the writer no plausible objection to the view that it was originally a part of the prophecy, and written by the prophet Habakkuk, although it may have been "worked over" by a later editor.

The "woes" here pronounced against the Chaldeans are very similar to those pronounced by Isaiah (ch. 10:5ff) against the Assyrians. The roles to be played by the two peoples were much the same. Both, in the thought of the two prophets were to be Yahweh's instruments of justice; but in their prosperity, both took another view of it. Their success had come through their own strength, they imagined.

When one remembers that Habakkuk was a strong admirer of

The situation was now changed, however, and the prophet, writing after the capture and destruction of Jerusalem, is trying to comfort his people. The whole sweep of their relation to the Chaldeans passes before him. In these verses he reminds his countrymen of the high hopes placed by them in the rising up of the Chaldeans. At that time they seemed to be Yahweh's chosen instrument to bring justice, and Freedom from oppression, to the oppressed Jews.

The prophet simply notes this in passing. This is not the "burden" of his prophecy. It comes later in his words to the effect that the haughty man shall perish, but the just shall live by his faith.

Now the prophet is simply giving them a bit of the history of their connection with the Chaldeans to make more impressive his prophecy, a little later touching the destruction that is to come to these marauding people.

As to the authenticity of 2:2-20, there seems to the writer no plausible objection to the view that it was originally a part of the prophecy, and written by the prophet Habakkuk, although it may have been "worked over" by a later editor.

The "woes" here pronounced against the Chaldeans are very similar to those pronounced by Isaiah (cf. 10:5ff) against the Assyrians. The roles to be played by the two peoples were much the same. Both, in the thought of the two prophets were to be Yahweh's instruments of justice; but in their prosperity, both took another view of it. Their success had come through their own strength, they imagined.

When one remembers that Habakkuk was a strong admirer of

the writings of Israel's greatest prophet, it is not surprising that he would imitate him in this matter of uttering maledictions against a tyrannical foe.

Further, the maledictions were the logical sequence of the situation described in ch. 1:12-17, and the vision referred to in ch. 2:2-4. If the proud and haughty Chaldean was to be destroyed, there would be the need of a detailed description of such destruction.

In the case of ch. 3, it appears evident to the writer that it did not originally belong with chapters 1 and 2.

In the first place, it does not seem to reflect the historical situation found in chs. 1 and 2. In ch. 1:2-4 the prophet is woefully disturbed about the chaotic conditions, socially and religiously, which exist among his people, and wonders why their God, Yahweh, allows such conditions to continue. In ch. 3:2 the writer apparently has no anxieties whatever. He is writing of Yahweh's work "In the midst of the years."

The theophany in ch. 3:3-13 shows the same dissimilarity, in a historical way, with chs. 1 and 2, as does ch. 3:2.

Chapter 3 seems to be a Psalm, formerly belonging to the Psalter, and taken from there by a devout Levite, during the 3rd Century B. C., and by him attached to the book of Habakkuk.

There is certain evidence in the Psalm itself which suggests its early connection. First, its title, "A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet set to Shigionoth". "Shigionoth" is a musical term, and its presence in this ode would suggest that it was used in the temple worship.

Again note the presence of the musical term "Selah", which

is found nowhere else but in the Psalter, except for the three times found in this chapter. And finally, note the subscription after v. 19, "For the chief musician, on my stringed instruments." This would seem to designate the particular collection of Psalms to which this hymn belonged. The fact that there were fifty-five Psalms collected in the middle Greek period for use in the synagogues, and in view of the further fact that the collection known as "Belonging to the Director" was formed during this same period, and that this title is attached to our Psalm, we conclude that it was during the middle Greek period that this Psalm was taken from the Psalter, and added to the book of Habakkuk.

One of the most difficult problems connected with the book of Habakkuk is that touching the date. Here we find, among scholars, the most divergent views.

If the authenticity of 1:5-6 is granted, the book was unquestionably written during the Chaldean period (625-538 B. C.). When it comes to a decision as to the particular time during this period when the book was composed, the evidence is not so clear. Further, every proposed solution of this problem must take into account, all the historical situations implied in ch. 1. For example, ch. 1:2-4 would suggest a date immediately following the battle of Carchemish, or near 600 B. C. Ch. 1:5-11, however, gives the impression of a different situation, a situation where the Chaldeans are better known than would appear to be possible in 600 B. C. A much fuller knowledge of the Chaldean character is suggested in ch. 1:12-17. Here we find a complete reversal of the apparently cordial feeling with which the Chaldean was welcomed in 1:5-6.

Any solution of the problem of the date of Habakkuk, we repeat, must take into account the marked change in style and spirit of the prophet's references to the Chaldeans.

The key to the solution of the problem seems to be: To think of the book as having been the result of religious reflection, spread over a long period, and representing conclusions reached after a long mental struggle.

To the writer it seems that the conditions described in 1:2-4 would have most likely have obtained during the period between 597 B. C. and 586 B. C., when, because of the instability of the national government, there would be more or less of violence and bloodshed, and frequent instances of the miscarriage and perversion of justice. That such conditions did prevail during this period is borne out by the prophecies of Ezekiel, known to have been uttered during this period.

Further, this view gives the longer time necessary for this prophet to get that fuller knowledge of the Chaldean character which he reveals in 1:5-11. Here it may be inferred from the prophet's tone that his people have had a chance to know at close range something of the Chaldean's prowess as a fighter and conqueror.

One occasion for this fuller knowledge would seem to be furnished in the first deportation of the Jews in 597 B. C. But even this instance of Chaldean military efficiency does not seem sufficiently drastic and cruel as to warrant the intense bitterness shown by the prophet in 1:12-17, against the cruel conquerors of his nation. Such an attitude can only be explained by some such event as the destruction of Jerusalem, in 586 B. C.,

where the king's sons were murdered before his eyes; the king himself blinded, and carried away in chains; the city given over to the soldiers for plunder; the city walls torn down; and the temple utensils carried away. to Babylon.

Here, in the mind of the writer, is to be found the occasion for the prophet's bitter reference to the Chaldeans in 1: 12-17. It was the memory of those awful days when Jerusalem was being plundered and her citizens carried into captivity that was in his mind when he said of their conquerors, "They have swallowed up nations more righteous than they."

If our view of the several historical situations, described in ch. 1 is correct, the book of Habakkuk was written shortly after the fall of Jerusalem, either 586 B. C. or 585 B. C. It was written while the national calamity was fresh in the minds of his readers.

In answer to the question as to how this date can square with the statement in 1:6 relative to the raising up of the Chaldeans, we reply, Habakkuk's work as a prophet did not consist in predicting the coming of the Chaldeans, but their downfall. His book was written to bring comfort to his sorrowing countrymen in Judah, who had almost lost hope because of the destruction of Jerusalem. It was his privilege to "write the vision" in such a way that all might read it, that their God Yahweh was still interested in righteous peoples; all others must ultimately perish. Only the righteous would live, and that because of their faith.

Some other reasons which support the view of the late date of Habakkuk are: (1) Unlike the other prophets, he makes no

mention of the doom that is to come to Judah; (2) His aim, apparently, is to comfort, and give encouragement to his people. This would suggest that he was a contemporary of Ezekiel after 586 B.C., because of Ezekiel's known change of his method of prophecy after that date. (3) The book was a "problem study", and these are known to have come much later in the history of Hebrew literature. (4) The question raised by the prophecy would seem to be most pertinent in a great national crisis such as the destruction of Jerusalem would bring.

And now summing up, briefly, the results of our study of the book of Habakkuk, we arrive at the following conclusions:

The Book of Habakkuk, as at present arranged, is composed of two entirely distinct sections, viz: chs. 1 and 2, and ch. 3. Chs. 1 and 2 were written by the prophet Habakkuk shortly after the fall of Jerusalem (586 or 585 B. C.) for the purpose of giving comfort and hope to his discouraged countrymen. Ch. 3 was originally a part of the Psalter used in the regular services of the second Temple, and was doubtless attached to the prophecy of Habakkuk by some devout Levite who recognized their spiritual kinship.

The terms "wicked" and "righteous" in 1:2-4 refer to the two classes of Jews in Palestine, but in 1:13 refer to the Chaldeans and Jewish victims, respectively. Because of the oppression of one class of Jews by their more fortunate countrymen, the Chaldeans were raised up to punish them. But in time the Chaldeans forgot their role as Yahweh's "rods of chastisement," and essayed to make conquests in their own right. Because of this change in their attitude they are to be severely punished.

The nature and character of their punishment is set forth in detail in 2:6-20.

The book is the result of years of reflection and meditation upon the strange workings of God in the recent misfortunes which had come to Israel, and represents the prophet's conclusions on the difficult problem. His solution is given in ch. 2:4, "The righteous shall live; and that by his faith."

The Book of Habakkuk made valuable contributions to the theological thinking of the Hebrews. In the matter of the Problem of Suffering, he was the first who really dared to question the traditional view that suffering was the result of sin. His answer was, as we have seen, that the righteous would ultimately triumph if they would possess themselves in patience.

In the matter of Israel's Apocalyptic hope, he was among the first to set forth the view, by implication, that "the day of Yahweh" was not the Exile, but was yet to come, and was to be a manifestation of Yahweh's power over a proud and haughty nation.

In his view of God, he was fully abreast of the most advanced conception of his day. The gods of the heathen were in reality no gods at all. The knowledge of the glory of Yahweh would ultimately spread over the world as the waters cover the sea. He was a practical monotheist.

Our study of one of the most remarkable little books ever written, has come to a close. It left its indelible impression upon the thought and life of Israel and thereby of all mankind. Wherever there is suffering; wherever and whenever any soul has the courage to break away from traditional conceptions of thought, and start out along different lines; wherever any individual or

group has the faith to trust the infinite God to ultimately cause the Right to triumph in His world, the teachings of the Book of Habakkuk will loom large in such an individual's or group's thinking, and be a mighty source of inspiration in whatever he or it accomplishes.

DAMAGED BOOK

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
02572 7597

Just Box Nbr: 280023606
SKP Box Nbr: 280023606
Location Id: B -1B-01-4-K1-0007-1-0
Column Id: N/A
File Descr: 11719025727597
Date: 06/11/2008
Box Type: 1.2
File Seq: 0001
B
* 0000003723187 7 *

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
NOT TO BE TAKEN
FROM THIS ROOM